

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 030

PS 011 183

AUTHOR Friedman, Dana E., Ed.
TITLE Community Solutions for Child Care: Report of a Conference.
INSTITUTION National Manpower Inst., Washington, D.C.; Women's Bureau (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 115p.; Report of Community Solutions for Child Care Conference (Washington, DC, March 7-8, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business Responsibility; Child Advocacy; *Child Care; *Community Involvement; *Community Responsibility; Community Services; *Day Care Services; Federal Programs; *Financial Support; Parent Education; Surveys; Technical Assistance.
IDENTIFIERS *Labor Responsibility

ABSTRACT

This conference report defines the need for community solutions for child care, discusses community child care provision and funding, and suggests strategies for child care advocates. The first two sections of the report discuss the results of the Family Circle Magazine Child Care Survey and foundation, government, labor and industry funding options. Subsequent sections provide descriptions of presently operating direct and indirect services which help parents meet their child care needs. Direct services have been provided by business and labor, the federal government, the public schools and academic communities and other local agencies. Indirect services provided by brokers who offer technical assistance, training, information and referral, and parent education are also described. The final section explores problems of developing a constituency for day care and emphasizes the importance of data, the media and national organizations for successful lobbying efforts. Materials related to the conference and topics discussed, such as tables, agenda, participant lists, helpful publications and child care programs in Federal agencies, industries and labor unions are included in eight appendices. (Author/RH)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Community Solutions for Child Care



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

Report of a Conference

U.S. Department of Labor
Office of the Secretary
Women's Bureau

August 1979

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED182030

PS 011183



Material contained in this publication is in the public domain and may be reproduced fully or partially, without permission of the Federal Government. Source credit is requested but not required. Permission is required only to reproduce any copyrighted material contained herein.

Opinions expressed in this report are those of the conference participants and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the U.S. Department of Labor, the National Manpower Institute, or the National Commission on Working Women.

Edited by
Dana E. Friedman

Cover Art by
Larry Smith

National Manpower Institute
1211 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036



International Year
of the Child 1979

This publication is one in a series being issued by the Women's Bureau in commemoration of the International Year of the Child, 1979.

Community Solutions for Child Care



Report of a Conference

Cosponsored by the
Women's Bureau and the
National Manpower Institute
with cooperation of the
National Commission on Working Women

U.S. Department of Labor
Ray Marshall, Secretary

Women's Bureau
Alexis M. Herman, Director

National Manpower Institute
Willard Wirtz, Chairman

National Commission on Working Women
Elizabeth D. Koontz, Chair

FOREWORD

Traditional resources for support of child care are decreasing just at a time when the need for and costs of quality care are increasing. Across the country people are looking to their own communities to provide solutions: child care advocates and providers are reaching out to the businesses and labor unions, to the school systems and churches, to community agencies and local foundations. They are designing solutions that work in their communities, that respond to their communities' needs, and stretch scarce resources.

These unique and exciting solutions are ready for replication. They take the form of statewide information and referral services; toy lending libraries; parent education seminars for employees; negotiated flextime and children's sick leave benefits; day care programs operated by hospitals, businesses, churches, and public schools; programs for before and after school, for infants and toddlers, or for drop-in purposes. These successes are found in every part of the country and in rural, urban, and suburban settings.

The purpose of this conference was to bring together some of the very talented people who have created and implemented these community solutions for child care. The diversity of participants and variety of solutions brought to the table new ideas to promote an awareness of child care as a concern to all sectors of the community, with special emphasis on the involvement of the private sector in local solutions.

Conference participants included representatives of business and industry, organized labor, foundations, national advocacy organizations concerned with children and youth, government agencies, local brokering groups such as Work-Education Councils from National Manpower Institute's Consortium of communities, churches, women's groups, and child care providers. Invitees were people who can influence change and who can act as catalysts for community support-- individuals familiar with public policies and data concerning child care; individuals who can demonstrate how people are providing for child care in diverse communities and settings; and labor, management, and industry representatives who are concerned with or involved in providing child care.

Conference participants arrived with their own and their communities' ideas about specific child care problems and

sets of resources, and left with feasible, next-step locally tailored ideas for child care solutions adaptable to their own communities. Those ideas make up this report.

Archie E. Lapointe
Executive Vice President
National Manpower Institute

Alexis M. Herman
Director
Women's Bureau

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The success of this conference, which was held in early March of 1979 in Washington, D.C., can be attributed to the wealth of expertise and significant devotion of time on the part of many people. The planning and organization required an intense and cooperative effort, responsibility for which was assumed primarily by the several conference sponsors.

Rosalind Thomas and Ruth Nadel from the Women's Bureau attended the planning meetings, made available resources of the Women's Bureau, and contributed to the invitation list and final report.

Joan Goodin and Sandi Risser from the National Commission on Working Women were also involved from the outset and assisted with the agenda, invitation list, and press coverage.

Major responsibility for organization of the conference was assumed by the National Manpower Institute, which committed resources and staff. Stephanie Lang Cole had the major responsibility for planning the agenda and invitation list, arranging for hotel accommodations, and editing this report for publication. Vivian Lee provided administrative support.

Substantive input was offered by two child care consultants, Jim Levine of the Wellesley Center for Research on Women and an author in the field, and Dana Friedman, former staffperson of the Coalition for Children and Youth and the Day Care and Child Development Council of America. Ms. Friedman was largely responsible for the agenda, speakers, packet materials, and the preparation of this report.

This conference was a collaborative effort, and its success is as much due to the participation of the sponsors as it is to the participation of those who attended. Everyone at the conference had something to offer and their combined input produced an exciting meeting full of community solutions for child care.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CONFERENCE OVERVIEW	1
The Conference Sponsors	2
The National Manpower Institute (NMI)	3
The National Commission on Working Women (NCWW)	3
The Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor	4
The Conference Participants	5
This Report	6
DEFINING THE NEED FOR COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS FOR CHILD CARE	8
The Family Circle Magazine Child Care Survey	9
The Need Related to Community Responsibility	11
FUNDING COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS FOR CHILD CARE	13
Foundation Funding	13
Government Funding	15
Labor and Industry Funding	20
PROVIDING COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS FOR CHILD CARE	25
Direct Service	25
Provided by Business and Labor	25
Stride Rite Children's Center	25
Intermedics	26
Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union (ACTWU)	27
Real Estate	28
Provided by the Federal Government	28

Provided by Public Schools	31
The Brookline Extended Day Program	31
Provided by the Academic Community	32
Provided by Local Agencies	33
YWCA, Jamestown, New York	33
Child's Play, Inc.	33
The Spanish Education Development Center (SED)	34
The Rosemont Center	34
Indirect Service	35
Technical Assistance and Training	35
Fairfax County Office for Children	35
Volunteer Urban Consultants	36
Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) of Central Florida	36
FOCAL	38
Work-Education Councils	39
Information and Referral	40
The Child Care Switchboard	40
The Day Care and Child Development Council of Tompkins County	41
Parent Education	42
Texas Child Care '76	42
Clayton Early Childhood Program	43
Special Solutions for Special Problems	44
The Sick Child	44
Sex Role Stereotyping	45

Transportation	45
For-Profit Child Care	45
ADVOCATING COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS FOR CHILD CARE	46
Developing a Coalition Constituency	46
Tools for Advocacy	48
The Importance of Data	48
Collecting Data While Educating Parents	49
Collecting Data Through Information and Referral	49
The Census Bureau	49
Media	50
National Advocacy Organizations	51
SUMMARY	53
REFERENCES	55
APPENDIX I: Tables	57
APPENDIX II: Agenda	64
APPENDIX III: Participant List	69
APPENDIX IV: Helpful Publications	80
APPENDIX V: National Organizations	82
APPENDIX VI: Research and Data Sources	85
APPENDIX VII: Funding Sources and Resources	92
APPENDIX VIII: Child Care Programs in Federal Agencies, Industries, and Labor Unions	102

CONFERENCE OVERVIEW

Many of the children who attend the Brookline, Massachusetts, public schools are staying after classes end. They are engaging in activities directed by volunteers from the community, until their parents finish working.

Texas parents working in local industries brown bag their lunches once a month while sharing their child care-related problems with people knowledgeable about resources in the community that can help. These lunches are arranged by their employers.

The children of jurors, witnesses, and attorneys are dropping in to the child care center at the District of Columbia Courthouse while their parents appear in court.

There is a network of 34 information and referral agencies for California parents to contact to help them make their child care arrangements.

In the State of Kansas, CETA employees are working in private homes to care for sick children while their parents are at work.

Real estate developers in Fairfax County, Virginia, brag about the excellent day care in the community as a major selling point. Their gratitude is expressed through the funding of a local child care information and referral service.

The ingenious creators of these efforts, and many more, came together in Washington, D.C., March 7-8, 1979, to share their secrets of success and their "Community Solutions for Child Care."

Many of the people involved with child care have begun looking beyond traditional sources of support. While they realize that the need for and costs of providing quality child care are increasing and available resources are decreasing, they also conclude that the care and responsibility for a community's young children are a shared burden. The realities of a sagging economy have prompted cuts in the Federal budget, primarily in the area of social services. The threat of recession has affected the stock market, which means that financial support from private foundations is also dwindling.

Yet, all across the country there is evidence of community wizardry, as in the examples above, for marshalling scarce resources and creating new bases of support for child care. These efforts thrive on local outreach to untapped, yet responsive sectors of the community and on the development of mechanisms and systems that stretch the dollar and foster a shared responsibility for child care.

The purpose of this conference was to harness the talent in the east and have it stimulate new solutions in the west; to examine the successes in the south and replicate them in the north; to see whether the advocacy strategies working in urban communities could be used in rural areas; and to highlight gaps in public sector commitment and fill them with the strengths of the private sector.

The purpose was achieved. It was possible because the differences among participants were transcended by their common commitment to children and families; because their collective wisdom was shared in an atmosphere of respect, appreciation, and friendship; and because they came together not to respond to a legislative crisis that threatened their programs, but to take control of the times and social changes affecting their communities. This sense of social responsibility was heightened through the conference, and was fostered by the sponsors who shared it wholeheartedly.

The Conference Sponsors

The sponsors of this conference--the National Manpower Institute, the National Commission on Working Women, and the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor--have made a commitment to community solutions for child care. They do so, not on the basis of any legislative mandate or recommendations from a statistical analysis of data, but on their sensitivity to the real, expressed, emotional needs of working parents, particularly women, who keep saying they need solutions for their child care problems.

The sponsors all are in some way involved with women and employment issues, yet they all see the larger picture and the extent to which they must relate their concerns to the plethora of issues facing communities and society. The sponsors represent a nonprofit organization, a national commission, and a government bureau that have fine-tuned their capacities to listen.

The National Manpower Institute (NMI)

Organized in 1971 by a group of corporate representatives, labor officials, and educators, NMI is a private, nonprofit organization working on "an agenda for rethinking learning and earning in America." The Institute focuses on ways to develop the nation's human resources through the collaboration of management, labor, education, government, and service agencies at the local, State, and national levels.

NMI's National Center for Educational Brokering is developing a network of skilled professionals who can provide education and training counseling to adults. The Center for Education and Work concentrates on easing transitions between education and work. Beginning first with youth, this Center has helped 20 communities and one State develop local work-education councils. These councils have become successful mechanisms for linking disparate sectors of the community. Work-education council representatives were present at the conference to explore ways in which this vehicle could be used for addressing child care concerns.

NMI's interest in child care is primarily a response to a series of regional dialogues sponsored by its Center for Women and Work which acts as the secretariat to the National Commission on Working Women. When women were asked about their problems related to employment opportunities, the number one issue was lack of available child care. NMI asked why.

The National Commission on Working Women (NCWW)

NCWW was created in 1977 as a nongovernmental action-oriented group of people from academia, business, labor, Congress, the media, and the grassroots. The Commission focuses on that 80 percent of women in the labor force who hold lower-paying pink and blue collar jobs in clerical and service occupations, retail sales, factories, and plants. NMI's Center for Women and Work serves as the Commission's secretariat and implements its programs.

In addition to a number of other projects, the Commission sponsors a career counseling project in cooperation with six working women's organizations from across the country. The project provides career consultation and seminars for clerical workers with emphasis on the banking, insurance, and publishing industries. In September 1978, NCWW and George Washington University co-sponsored a Research Roundtable to develop research projects on working

women in areas such as child care, job evaluation, and training.

Last year, NCWW and NMI's Center for Women and Work organized the regional dialogues that elicited women's concerns about child care. They also conducted a national survey of working women with the cooperation of eight national magazines and numerous union publications. On the basis of 150,000 responses, 30 percent of the women already working felt that child care was a problem. Of those seeking employment, 60 percent anticipated problems in making their child care arrangements. NCWW asked why.

The Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor

Its mandate to promote the welfare of wage-earning women has linked the Women's Bureau to child care issues for almost all of its 59-year history. In the early 1920s the Bureau was already raising questions about the number of women who were mothers and the kinds of arrangements working women were able to make for the care of their children, and by the 1930s the number of women with children and of women who were heading families was being reported in publications on working women. A separate report on "Employed Women and Child Care," published in 1933, contained information about the number of nursery schools and day care centers and their locations.

In 1960, the Women's Bureau co-sponsored with the Children's Bureau the first National Conference on Day Care for Children. Since that time the Bureau has participated in numerous conferences on child care, and has published reports on child care in hospitals, industry, educational institutions, and the Federal government to provide information about and encourage the development of child care facilities in private industry and in the public sector.

The Women's Bureau also helped the Department of Labor establish the first government-sponsored child care center in 1968, and initiated and still coordinates the Alliance for Child Care in Government Agencies, nine of which now have on-site child care centers in the Washington, D.C., area.

During 1977, the Women's Bureau held a series of regional meetings with low income women of diverse racial, ethnic, geographic, and community backgrounds. Lack of adequate child care was repeatedly cited as a principal barrier to employment and training opportunities. The Bureau is developing two training models at the present time to encourage CETA programs and local organizations to work together in addressing the need for competent child care workers.

With this background, the Women's Bureau has had the foresight to begin exploring alternatives to Federal funding and the kinds of community solutions addressed by this conference. Over the years, the Bureau has been telling us why.

The Conference Participants

This conference gathered together a talented and diverse group of conferees. One way to describe the group is to relate the outcome of an exercise lead by Ellen Hoffman of the Children's Defense Fund prior to her presentation. When asked the following questions about themselves, conferees responded as follows:

<u>Question</u>	<u>Answer</u>
How many of you are child care providers?	A few
How many of you are parents who have needed child care?	A lot
How many of you are child care advocates?	All
How many of you come from a community with enough child care?	None

These conference participants included representatives from all sectors of the community that have provided solutions for child care needs or that have the potential for doing so. Thirty-six of the 65 participants came with community solutions to share. They fall into three categories:

Child care providers included staffs of preschool programs, infant care centers, family day care homes, after-school programs, drop-in centers, bilingual and handicapped projects, campus child care programs, and church- and YWCA-sponsored centers.

Brokers included representatives from agencies thought of as catalysts that serve a mediating function in the community as they try to link different agencies and community resources. Represented were information and referral agencies, NMI's work-education councils, parent education programs, Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) Programs, family day care associations, federations of child care centers, and training centers.

Business and labor participants represented companies that provide on-site child care or contract out to community programs to provide child care for their employees, corporations that offer family-related benefits to their employees such as flextime and paternity leave, and places of business that support their employees in their child rearing roles through provision of parent education seminars or information and referral services. Also included were representatives of unions that provide child care or family-related benefits to their members.

The remaining participants were those whose job is to monitor community solutions and to integrate them into the framework of public, decision-making responsibilities. This group included representatives from government agencies, Congressional committees and staffs, foundations, media, national advocacy organizations, consulting and research firms, and universities.

There was at least one person representing every child care arrangement, sponsor, funder, and supporter. They were all amazed at each other's successes and ingenuity. We heard throughout the two-day conference: "You're kidding! I didn't know you could do that!"

This Report

This conference report hopes to re-echo that exclamation through descriptions of these unique community solutions for child care shared by the participants. The solutions were discussed against the background of major child care issues and in the context of using the expertise gathered at the conference to increase the base of community support for child care. The conferees shared some basic assumptions and some primary concerns.

There was firm agreement that child care should not be viewed exclusively as a women's or poor people's issue. Men are increasingly responsible for the care of their children, and a Family Circle magazine survey has highlighted the child care problems faced by middle income families. Thus, in an effort to broaden a coalition constituency in support of child care, it was perceived as a quality of life issue. Jane Whitbread summarized the point:

Assuming that child care is mainly a problem of the poor and of women, cuts out a huge constituency of enormous power and potential

in getting an adequate system of child care established in the United States.

Conferees also accepted Willard Wirtz' notion of changing the terminology in the hope of building that coalition constituency. He suggested the term "extended child care," rather than "child care" to more accurately reflect and extend the family concept to include the community.

The need for multiple funding sources was repeatedly emphasized. It was suggested that the complexity that results from "cafeteria funding" may be eased by groups working together or forming federations and associations.

Considerable emphasis was placed on the relatively untapped potential in the business and labor communities. Conferees identified a variety of ways in which support can be offered, from on-site child care, donation of expertise and materials, provision of parent education seminars, to family support benefits such as flextime and sick-child leave. Of prime importance was the development of approaches to corporations and labor unions to show them how their support of child care is actually in their own self-interest.

Conferees also learned how best to present a case for the need for child care by using media and data resources, particularly those available from monitoring information and referral services and from the Census Bureau. They also heard from national advocacy organizations willing to offer technical assistance, networking participation, and legislative updates.

The resource most crucial to the process of identifying and meeting the community's need for child care was the leadership represented at this conference. It was the community leaders from across the country who identified ingredients for success, and it is they who have returned to their communities to try some of the solutions shared at this conference. It is hoped that readers of this report will be equally stimulated and motivated to try some of the ideas presented.

DEFINING THE NEED FOR COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS FOR CHILD CARE

For many years, the need for child care has been expressed in terms of the number of preschool children whose mothers work (6.4 million) compared to the number of licensed child care spaces (1.6 million).^{1/} Advocates claiming an unmet need for about five million children forget that most parents are using unlicensed care, and that it is not just working mothers who need child care for their children. Men and those seeking employment should be included. These figures also say nothing about the quality of the available care.

Statistics presented in the tables in appendix I may show more broadly the child care needs of families of different income levels and races. It is particularly important to note the changes within the last decade.

Forty million women were in the labor force in 1977, accounting for 40 percent of the total labor force and 49 percent of all women over 16 years of age.^{2/} The median income for women in 1977 was \$8,814, while men's income averaged \$15,020.^{3/} The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that between 1975 and 1990, nearly 12 million women will be added to the labor force. Most of the increase will be among women ages 25-44 -- child bearing and child rearing ages.^{4/}

Since the period immediately preceding World War II, the number of working women has more than doubled, but the number of working mothers has increased tenfold.^{5/} Nearly half (49 percent) of all mothers were in the labor force in 1976, compared with 35 percent in 1965, 27 percent in 1955, and 9 percent in 1940.^{6/} In many instances working mothers raise family income above the poverty level. Among working mothers living with their husbands, 20 percent had husbands with incomes under \$7,000 in 1975.^{7/}

In addition, nearly half (46 percent) of all children under 18 years of age have mothers in the work force. From 1970 to 1976, the number of children in the population dropped by 6 percent, but the number of children whose mothers worked or sought work rose by 10 percent to 28.2 million. Of the 28.2 million children whose mothers were working in 1976:

- 21.7 million were ages 6-17;
- 6.4 million were under the age of 6;
- 5.3 million were children of working mothers who headed a household; and

22.8 million were children of wife-husband families. 8/

Statistics on availability of child care show that in 1977 there were 18,300 child care centers in the U.S. of which 8,000 were Federal Financial Participation Centers which serve 400,000 children (about 45 percent of the national center enrollment). Care for 225,000 of these children was paid, at least in part, by direct government reimbursement. Care for the remaining 175,000 children was paid for primarily by parent fees. 9/ Approximately two-fifths of the centers operate on a for-profit basis. The remaining three-fifths are nonprofit and may be run by churches or local community organizations. 10/ Among them, about 4 percent are Head Start programs that provide no less than 25 hours a week of care for nine months of the year. Seventy-two percent of the children in child care centers are three to five years old, while 14 percent are infants/toddlers and another 14 percent are school-age. 11/

Most children, however, receive care in unlicensed facilities of unknown quality. There are 5.1 million children in family day care homes, 12/ approximately 90 percent of which are unlicensed. Arthur Emlen points out in his article, "Slogan, Slots and Slander: The Myth of Day Care Need" (1973), that "family day care accounts for but 20 percent of the children under 6 of full-time working mothers, but this is twice the number in group care facilities." Seventy percent of the children remain at home with relatives. Emlen goes on to say that the "use of nonrelatives now competes in magnitude with the use of kin as a child care resource both in and out of the home." 13/

The Family Circle Magazine Child Care Survey

Family Circle magazine conducted a survey on child care needs that confirms some of these trends and statistics. (The survey ran in April 1978; the results were published February 20, 1979.) Other issues emerged from the survey to which attention should also be given--primarily the child care needs of the middle class. The findings of this survey were presented to conference participants.

Family Circle publishes 17 issues a year that are read by 20 million people. Half of the readers are women who work. The self-administered questionnaire on child care generated 10,000 responses and hundreds of long, thoughtful letters about child care problems.

The sample of respondents is not a representative cross section of the American population: the lower socio-economic groups are underrepresented and the sample was skewed because it eliminated those who cannot read. Analysis was conducted on 3,000 of the 10,000 responses so as to stratify the sample and obtain a representative cross section of the respondents. Most respondents were young women between 25 and 34. Seventy-four percent were married and 43 percent were college graduates. The average salary for full-time employees was \$8,300.

The Family Circle results highlight some of the problems that have long been plaguing child care advocates, but they also contradict what other consumer surveys have shown. Family Circle found that as few as one in ten working mothers prefers to leave her children with a relative. Reasons offered were that the relatives were working themselves or they were not close enough geographically to make it convenient. A Department of Commerce study found, however, that 75 percent of children aged 3 to 13 were being cared for by parents or relatives and the Unco Child Care Consumer Survey found 44 percent of children in the care of relatives.

Family Circle found that 92.7 percent of the survey mothers with children under 6 use day care mothers, sitters, family homes, preschools, and day care centers for child care. Only one mother in five has any kind of relative--including husbands--to care for the children in her stead. Relatives to care for older children are even scarcer. One mother in 1,000 can depend on her husband for after-school care for 6-13 year olds. Only 4.2 percent have any relatives available for after-school care. Thirty percent reported that children aged 6 to 13 are either home alone after school or with brothers and sisters. Another 15 percent left the question unanswered, suggesting they had no appropriate arrangements to report.

Many respondents were dissatisfied with their child care arrangements and three out of five survey mothers had changed their care arrangements in the past two years. More than half changed because the care was unreliable and of poor quality.

The survey asked what kind of care mothers would prefer if they had a choice. The answers offered compelling evidence that the informal, haphazard arrangements mothers often make do not begin to meet their needs.

Only 17.5 percent--less than half the group now using such care--would choose day care mothers or family homes

if they could pick the care they want for their children under six. By contrast, 44 percent would select day care centers or pre-schools with well trained staff and a stimulating program of activities and rest. Mothers complain that children left with day care mothers or in family homes are often kept pacified with junk food and television. "It's nothing but custodial chaos," one mother said.

What kind of a child care system do working mothers want? Survey respondents say they would choose a system that makes care available to all and they don't want it for nothing. They want a sliding scale of fees based on income. They prefer to pay their way for good child care and they want to have a say in their children's day time care. Nor do they want a one-track system. They prefer a diverse system with home care, family care, center care, employer-based care, care involving older school children and older citizens, and possibly some form of tax credit that would enable mothers who prefer to stay home to do so, or help mothers who want to work to pay for their child care.

The significance of the survey is in its support of child care as more than a poor women's issue. Jane Whitbread, an author and conference participant, detailed some of the survey results that showed that women's salaries raise the two-earner family's annual income from \$18,000 to \$25,000. Ms. Whitbread speculated that the higher the inflation rate goes, the more middle class mothers, who might otherwise stay home until their children were old enough to go to school, will be forced into employment. Strengthening this argument further, Ms. Whitbread recounted that mothers with children under 3 now represent 40 percent of all mothers who work. Half the mothers with children aged 3 to 5 are now back at work. In 1978, there was an 11 percent growth of working mothers with babies which makes that group the fastest growing group in the labor force. Ms. Whitbread concluded:

If there is no adequate child care, it makes of women a regular supply of part-time, temporary, marginal labor and threatens their own standard of living and their union contracts.

The Need Related to Community Responsibility

As the data indicate, when we speak of child care, we are addressing much more than the needs of working women. Child care must be considered in relation to changing family patterns, to the high divorce rate resulting in an increase in single parent families, usually with mothers

but some with fathers having custody of the children. The need for child care is related to income and the extent to which parents (at all income levels) can afford quality care. It is related to welfare and the degree to which provision of child care frees parents to work and reduces dependency on public subsidies. It is related to our system of taxation and involves issues related to Federal-State relations, government regulation and intervention, local fire and safety codes, transportation and zoning ordinances. Child care becomes a solution for the children born into this world because medicaid payments for abortion were terminated, affecting primarily low income women. This is particularly important today with the enormous increase in teenage pregnancies. Child care programs help families deal with problems related to their children's health, nutrition, handicaps, or learning disabilities. They are educational vehicles for bilingual families. They can serve as reporting and counseling vehicles where there is child abuse or neglect. Child care programs can employ welfare recipients, youth, and senior citizens. Child care issues embody the essence of women's rights, civil rights, equal opportunity, and affirmative action.

But who should take on the responsibility for defining the child care needs in a community? Many of the conference participants became involved in child care because of personal experiences. Dick Tritter, president of Child Care Suppliers, Inc., a firm that helps employers assess the child care needs of their employees and design appropriate programs, started his business when his wife wanted to continue working after the birth of their first child and they could not find child care. His business is based on his belief that "child care is a matter of the community's responsibility and an employer or union is part of that community." Alexa Robinson was looking for child care near her downtown office and, finding none, created a program and incorporated it into Child's Play, Inc. While working with the Labor-Management Committee of Jamestown, New York, John Eldred watched the decline of his community's economy. The average age of residents was 55 and over and no young people had been trained to take their places in the factories. The Committee managed to cut strike days by 70 percent and recruit a new factory to get them back on their feet. Mr. Eldred saw attention to child care as a necessary component of strengthening his community's sagging economy.

7
how the provision of child care is in their self-interest. This invariably means relating child care to the economic viability of the community, as Mr. Eldred tries to do.

Whatever sector of the community they represented and whatever their own primary self-interest in child care was, the conference participants were in total agreement that adequate provision of child care is a human resource issue--a quality of life issue for parents and for children. As such, the entire community has a responsibility for--and a stake in--providing solutions for child care.

FUNDING COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS FOR CHILD CARE

It is estimated that in the United States \$10 billion a year is spent on child care. The Federal government spends \$2.5 billion; families spend \$6 billion; and State, county, or local agencies spend the remainder.

The resources that support the provision of child care are not always easily identified. When they are, it is likely that most social agencies have discovered them and that there is fierce competition for scarce funds. It takes all of your creative genius to find out everything you always wanted to know about funding sources in the community--and to not be afraid to ask. It takes aggressive leadership to successfully raise funds. It is also virtually impossible for a child care program to exist on one source of funding, and with the combining of funding sources comes complexity. It takes sophistication--and a lot of aspirin--to match financial resources and program components.

A conference panel discussed financial resources and future prospects for funding from government, foundations, and the business and labor community. The message from all three sectors confirmed the purpose of the conference: One must look beyond traditional sources of funding, and look for community solutions.

Foundation Funding

There are approximately 20,000 foundations in the United States. A survey of foundations listed in the Foundation Directory identified 63 that fund projects and organizations relating to children's services. Of these, 31 specifically fund child care.¹⁴ These include such reputable

philanthropies as the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and the Lilly Endowment.

Corporate foundations such as Levi Strauss and Shell Oil have contributed monies to child care efforts. Texas Child Care '76, which sponsors parent education seminars in businesses around the State, receives funding from both of these foundations. Levi Strauss also funds a family day care training project at the Southern Regional Education Board.

The Foundation for Child Development (FCD) has the longest history of foundation involvement in child care issues. It began as the Association for the Aid of Crippled Children in 1908 and changed its name in 1972 to reflect its broader interest in child development research, primarily in social and emotional development; research into indicators of the social and economic conditions in which children live; and provision of public information and advocacy through dissemination and litigation. These efforts are designed to "increase our knowledge about children and help translate this knowledge into policies that affect their daily lives and those of their families."

A recent project directed by Truda Lash, Senior Staff Scientist for FCD, addressed the state of the child in New York City and provided data on the living conditions, health, education, and family composition of New York City's children. The final report for this study was well received by the public and is now annually updated in an attempt to reform and improve services and conditions for children in New York City.

Ms. Lash told conferees of the Foundation's commitment to learning about efforts at the local level and helping the grassroots in the belief that "small communities can play a larger part for their children." She explained that foundations often stay away from funding direct services because of the potential destruction of programs that receive foundation monies for 2 or 3 years and then have funding terminated. Money for demonstration projects is generally more forthcoming.

Edward Zigler, former director of the Office of Child Development in HEW, identified in a recent paper six principles for effective philanthropic efforts on behalf of children. First, when funding projects, foundations should include support for continuity and follow-up efforts. They should support policy centers rather than expert panels and commissioned reports which come and go quickly. Foundations should also support public awareness efforts,

devote their energies toward incremental solutions to large problems, recognize that our knowledge base is not the same for all children's issues, and consider the cost effectiveness and replicability of demonstrations. Of prime importance, they should not duplicate publicly funded efforts, nor ignore problems that government has avoided. 15/

According to Dr. Zigler, the Foundation for Child Development would appear very "principled." More importantly, it is committed to the issues it addresses.

Ms. Lash appropriately closed her remarks by urging a commitment to helping develop community strength, and community commitment to programs:

Nothing really works in any community that has to do with members of the community unless it is being monitored all the time. It should not be monitored by the government only--but by the community itself. If that stops, there's no guarantee that things will stay put.

Government Funding

The history of the relationship between foundation and government funding indicates that they compete with one another for ways of defining social and political reforms. While foundations have typically viewed their role as that of a catalyst, experimenting in areas untouched by government, some contend that the increased involvement of government in social, economic, and cultural life makes foundation investments indistinguishable from those of government.

Government, however, with much more money to spend, funds direct services and serves primarily low income families. An explanation of the Federal government's financial commitment to child care was given by Michio Suzuki, Deputy Commissioner of the Administration for Public Services (APS) in HEW. APS is that part of the Office of Human Development Services that administers Title XX of the Social Security Act (described below).

As reported by Mr. Suzuki, the Federal government spent approximately \$2.5 billion on child care in 1978. The FY 1978 estimate is that \$537 million of that was from Title XX monies; the amount is expected to increase to \$600 million in FY 1980. Ninety percent of direct Federal support (approximately \$1.8 billion) is invested

in six Federal programs. The remaining monies are applied indirectly, primarily through the child care tax credit.

Direct Federal subsidies include the following:

Title XX of the Social Security Act: Title XX was passed in 1975 and replaced Title IV-A of the act. It is the largest program of direct support for child care, accounting for \$537 million of the \$2.7 billion allocated to the States for all social services. HEW estimates that 800,000 children receive child care services each year through Title XX at a cost of \$1,013 per child.

Head Start: One of the Great Society programs, Head Start was created in 1964 as part of the Economic Opportunity Act. In FY 1977, Head Start appropriations totaled \$475 million which provided services for approximately 349,000 children. Head Start is the most expensive Federal education program on a per child basis (\$1,505 per child in full-year programs). This is due primarily to Head Start's comprehensive goals to provide medical, nutritional, and other social services to children served.

Child Care Food Program: The Department of Agriculture operates this program, designed to help child care institutions and providers serve nutritious meals to the children in their care. Reimbursements vary with the meal (snack, lunch, dinner) and with family income. USDA serves approximately 580,000 children with an investment of \$120 million.

ESEA Title I: Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act enables local education agencies (LEAs) to receive grants for supplementary compensatory education for children in disadvantaged areas. Title I spends \$136 million on 367,000 children in preschool and kindergarten (only 8 percent of all children served by Title I funds).

AFDC Work Expense Allowance: Title IV-A of the Social Security Act, portions of which Title XX replaced in 1975, allows applicants for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) additional assistance for child care when necessary to help them find employment. HEW estimates that

in FY 1977, approximately \$84 million of AFDC money was spent on 145,000 children.

Work Incentive Program (WIN): The Departments of Labor and HEW provide work incentives through training and job placement services. In order to be eligible for AFDC, all clients, except single mothers with children under six, must register for WIN. States must provide child care services to WIN recipients so that they are free to accept training and employment. About \$57 million (one-third) of WIN monies are used to serve approximately 85,000 children.

There are two indirect Federal subsidies:

The Child Care Tax Credit: Expenses incurred for the care of dependents may be claimed by taxpayers if the expenditure enables parents to work or go to school. In 1976, 2.7 million taxpayers claimed dependent care credits averaging \$170, and costing the Federal government approximately \$500 million. It is estimated that at least 4 million children are affected by this credit.

Amortization of Child Care Facilities: Another indirect subsidy is the amortization of child care facilities whereby, instead of depreciating facilities over their useful life, employers may amortize over a five-year period. This rapid amortization was intended as an incentive for employers to create child care facilities for use by employees, but it has not been widely used. Employers may not claim both rapid amortization and an investment tax credit, and the amortization alone does not seem sufficient to encourage employer-subsidized child care.

Finally, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) provides both direct and indirect support to child care. CETA eligible clients, such as migrant farmworkers, displaced homemakers, and single parents, are entitled to child care services. Public service jobs are also offered to the economically disadvantaged and job placement may be made in child care programs, indirectly supporting the provision of child care. Training for child care work is another option for community agencies and advocacy groups to pursue, under Title II of the reauthorized act.

In his strong recommendation for use of multiple funding,

Mr. Suzuki informed the group that some Federal monies may be used to match other Federal monies. These include child care monies from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Juvenile Justice, the Appalachian Regional Commission, and the food program in the Community Services Administration (CSA). Due to the complexity of multiple funding, Mr. Suzuki urged programs to work within systems. One conference participant, Phoebe Carpenter from 4-C of Central Florida, which operates a system, met the required 25 percent match for Title XX with 12 percent community funds and 12 percent Federal funds.

Mr. Suzuki concluded with some good news and some bad news. The good news: "Federal resources will not dry up." The bad news: "Federal resources will not increase rapidly enough to meet the needs. I can't see an immediate increase given the state of the economy." The moral of the story: "Child care programs need the biggest bang for the buck."

In response to Mr. Suzuki, Phoebe Carpenter described how child care does give the biggest return on the dollar invested:

We find that child care programs put more money back into the public system than the public system paid for the program--and believe me, you can sell that. It's not unlike building a road with tax dollars on which the trucks roll to let commerce take place. We want child care out of social service and see it as a public service.

Jan Calderón Yocum has used the same argument in Wichita, Kansas, to convince city leaders that their investment in child care resulted in increased tax revenues, increased purchases of goods and services, and reduced welfare rolls as a result of enabling people to work.

Ellen Hoffman of the Children's Defense Fund (CDF) took issue with some of the comments made by Mr. Suzuki. Ms. Hoffman felt "there is no (Federal) commitment to significantly expanding or even significantly improving the quality of existing child care services." She advised the group to look at Arabella Martinez's (Assistant Secretary, Office of Human Development Services, HEW) testimony against the Child Care Act of 1979 and to read between the lines of the 1980 Federal budget as evidence.

Ms. Hoffman felt that HEW was not creating a realistic picture of solutions for child care. The Department of HEW has set a new tone, making a "statement about the incredible wealth of Federal resources and all the people at the local level need to do is figure how to understand all the regulations and fill out all the applications, and we'd have all of the \$2.5 billion in Title XX. In reality, that's not true."

Ms. Hoffman provided a legislative update and reported that there may not be any increases in child care expenditures under Title XX unless the ceiling is raised.

Ms. Hoffman was also concerned that the \$200 million within Title XX earmarked for child care be retained. This money was originally intended to help States improve the quality of child care programs and becomes important as the debates around the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) are resolved. The FIDCR standards must be met by all child care providers receiving Title XX funding. The proposed revisions of these standards will be announced during 1979. There will be a 90-day comment period during which groups should write to HEW and participate in public hearings. A creative public participation effort is planned by the regulations team at HEW to ask national and local groups to sponsor hearings. Packets of materials will be available on how to hold a hearing and the questions to be asked. A videotape explaining the proposed regulations will accompany this packet.

Ms. Hoffman said Head Start's funding level has remained constant over the years and still serves only 25 percent of the eligible children. One year ago, a concerted and successful effort was made by a group of organizations to increase Head Start funding. While the Administration has proposed a \$20 million increase in FY 1979-80 and estimates services for 20,000 more children, CDF computers show that \$20 million will not serve any more children due to increases in the cost of living, inflation, and Social Security taxes. CDF estimates the need for \$50 million more than the current funding level.

Conferees learned about the Child Care Act of 1979 (S.4), which was introduced by Senator Cranston from California, as the third effort for comprehensive child care within the last nine years. It was primarily aimed at children of working parents and included all the ingredients of a comprehensive system. Some of the controversial issues of years past were included as well: a voucher system, training for unemployed school teachers, and eligibility

of for-profit child care centers. One of the purposes of the legislation was to begin the dialogue on comprehensive child care again and potentially ward off the kind of backlash that prompted the stinging smear campaign against the Child and Family Services Act of 1975. The strategy was not successful, however, and letters began pouring into Senators' offices, editorials were abundant singing the old refrain that child care weakens the family, and Arabella Martinez's testimony not only opposed the legislation, but did so on the basis that the need for more child care does not exist.

In an effort to determine the level of support that Senator Cranston could expect from the advocacy community in helping respond to the criticism, he called a meeting of Washington-based child care organizations. He did not receive the support he had hoped for. CDF was one group that did not pledge its support, due to substantive differences with the legislation and little hope for passage. Senator Cranston had no choice but to withdraw his support for S.4.

Labor and Industry Funding

Many advocates are beginning to look to the business and labor communities for some of the financial support of child care. The extent of their involvement at this time is limited; a consciousness raising effort is needed so the business and labor communities recognize their potential benefits from involvement in child care. John Eldred of Jamestown, New York, has found that the primary concern of managers is stress, and they are becoming more receptive to ideas and mechanisms that can help reduce personal stress for working people. Mr. Eldred also highlighted the emphases on interdependence and volunteerism in the labor/management sector. Pat Neighbors from Avon Corporation supported this by noting "there's a growing pressure today in the corporate world for volunteerism. We should take advantage of that growing movement within corporations to encourage their members to volunteer in community services."

There are many options available to employers for easing the child care burdens of their employees. As listed by Miriam Kertzman of the Stride Rite Children's Center in Massachusetts, industry can contribute in the following ways:

- Have an on-site facility, as occurs at Stride Rite.
- Have a voucher system for employees to purchase their own child care.
- Form a consortium with other companies for a facility adjacent to all*.
- Purchase spaces from local centers for employees, as Polaroid Corporation does.
- Lend their business expertise to local programs, e.g., accounting services, tax help, advertising and public relations, management systems, and training of child care staff for any or all of the above.
- Use their political power base in advocacy efforts.
- Supply industrial scrap for recycling at child care centers.
- Join citizen advocacy groups.
- Make direct financial contributions to a local center.
- Provide parent education.
- Allow employee benefits to include flextime, sick-child leave, paternity leave, etc.

Little is known about the use of some of these options, but a survey of employer-sponsored or supported day care centers was conducted in 1978 by conference participant, Kathryn Senn Perry from Wisconsin. Her findings are presented below.

Identified in the U.S. were 9 day care centers sponsored by industries, 7 sponsored by labor unions with funds from employers of union members (all belong to the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union), 14 sponsored by government agencies, and 75 sponsored by hospitals. Since 1968, the number of hospital centers has decreased by 23 percent, and since 1970 the number of industry centers has dropped

* This was tried in Minneapolis in 1971 by Control Data Corporation, which cooperated with a local department store and Federal Reserve Bank in forming the Northside Child Development Center (no longer in operation).

by two centers. The estimated enrollment in the employer-sponsored day care centers by center sponsorship was: industry, 545; labor union, 1,445; government agency, 825; and hospital, 5,604.

Also identified were day care centers located on military installations and sponsored by branches of the armed services for the use of the military and, in many cases, civilian employees who worked on the base. The military day care centers usually provided "drop-in" care for a few hours as well as full-day care. The number of military centers identified by branch of the military were Army, 50; Air Force, 89; Navy, 46; and Marine Corps, 15. Estimated enrollment in military centers was 25,059.

Differences among types of employer-sponsored centers were in years in operation, enrollment, and teaching staffs. Military centers had been in operation longer than civilian centers, and, among civilian centers, hospital centers had been in operation longer than both industry centers and government agency centers. Military centers had larger enrollments than civilian centers. Civilian centers hired more teachers with college degrees and had larger full-time teaching staffs than did military centers, but military centers had larger part-time teaching staffs than civilian centers.

Benefits which resulted from the employer-sponsored centers were reported by 72 centers. The number of centers reporting each benefit were: lower job turnover rate of employees, 34; lower absenteeism of employees, 49; easier recruitment of new employees, 53; development of more positive attitude of employees toward sponsoring organization, 38; and the development of more positive attitude of employees toward work experience, 40.

Reasons that contributed to the closing of 18 employer-sponsored day care operations by number of employers reporting reason were: not enough employees wanting service to fill center, 11; high cost of employer subsidies, 9; center not needed to attract and keep steady work force, 4; administrative problems, 4; facility needed for other uses, 3; and employees unwilling to pay costs, 3. 16

Conference participants learned about the benefits of employer-subsidized child care and ways to present convincing arguments to industry. On-site child care is capable of reducing absenteeism, turnover, tardiness (due to the shortened commute time), and training costs. Where employees' children can be taken care of conveniently and with qualified personnel, there is an incentive for employees to stay with an employer. The provision of child care can change the morale of employees through reduced child care worries and increased respect for the employer. It can humanize the workplace, help the company develop good public relations, provide a competitive edge in recruiting employees, and place the company in a favorable Equal Employment Opportunity position. It can help avoid corporate relocation by attracting women into the labor market at times when local resources seem exhausted in a given wage/skill category. By removing the single major block for most women in seeking employment, the employer can expect longtime loyalty from these employees, lower-than-normal turnover rates, and better job performance. As Mike Lyden said:

Employers are concerned in a very direct and immediate sense with the retention of those young women they so recently brought along in a skilled, blue-collar trade. The provision of day care is seen as a potential option that they might have at their disposal to retain this very important element of the work force.

The advantages to employees and their children are also significant. Of prime importance is the potential for strengthening family ties. Children and parents are in closer proximity to one another, especially important in cases of emergency. They spend more time together commuting to and from work. Exposure to the developmental growth of their children helps to break the pattern of isolation of working mothers from their children. Parents also have immediate and constant access to teachers who can help with parenting skills. Involved parents can benefit from improved interpersonal relationships with other parents working in other parts of the company. The reduced absenteeism and tardiness, as well as the shortened commute saves time and money that might otherwise be lost from work. Dick Tritter points out that the existence of quality child care can make the difference between a family's earning a single wage, or being able to earn two full wages.

Tritter, President of Child Care Suppliers, Inc., lists three convincing reasons why an employer should sponsor child care facilities:

- Currently, child care centers have long waiting lists--often children are registered even before birth. Due to Federal non-involvement in funding of new centers, there is severe difficulty in raising start-up capital.
- Corporate employers receive direct benefits from child care facilities. This, plus the greater availability of capital funds to industry, makes the employer a logical source of capital to fund child care center start-ups.
- Capital used to start a child care center can be carried as a capital asset. Where a center's running costs are paid 100 percent by the employees using its facilities for their children, the employer/sponsor need only contribute the use of the start-up capital which may be recoverable.

It is appropriate to conclude this discussion of funding sources with a description of a program that combines almost all of the solutions mentioned thus far. Responsibility for one of the most innovative and resourceful programs in the country can be attributed to Jan Calderón Yocum, who is currently Executive Director of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America. She went to Washington in 1978, after seven years directing the Wichita Day Care Association (WDCA) in Kansas. The WDCA began by working with 40 family day care homes on a United Way budget of \$50,000. Today it receives \$4 million from 15 different funding sources, and another \$2 million in non-cash contributions from the community.

The child care system requires the coordination of funds, which Ms. Yocum says is "in truth, a juggling act requiring a great deal of skill and being a con-man or -woman." As an agency, WDCA is a conduit for Title XX monies which it subcontracts out to the 27 centers and 400 family day care homes that belong to WDCA. It also sponsors the Child Care Food Program, parents anonymous, a women's crisis center, teenage parent programs, and undocumented alien programs. It is the training center for WIN and CETA, and relies on additional funding from the Community Development Act, revenue sharing, Model Cities, Head Start...and more.

WDCA receives approximately \$50,000 worth of free legal services from the local Bar Association. The United Way provides one nurse, and Head Start monies provide for two nurses who work in WDCA's Health Program designed to coordinate health services. Working with the hospital's nursing school, WDCA arranged for nurses to work in child care centers and family day care homes. There are currently 350 nurses in Wichita's child care centers each week. This program is so integral to the nursing program and to the community that Ms. Yocum is sure it would survive if the Association died. Hospitals are also providing children's health evaluations and evening clinics for a nominal fee.

In order to combine funding sources, Ms. Yocum recommends developing a five-year plan addressing:

- What you want to accomplish each year
- With what funds
- How the funds complement each other
- How to become self-sufficient after funding dies

Ms. Yocum also recommended being realistic and knowledgeable about the characteristics of the funding groups. She also encouraged the involvement of parents. With these principles, she traveled around the county, picking into every available community pocketbook--Ms. Yocum traveled with a free gas credit card donated by an oil company that received a tax deduction for its contribution.

PROVIDING COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS FOR CHILD CARE

There are many ways to help parents meet their child care needs. They include both direct and indirect services. The community solutions that are currently serving in both these ways are described below.

Direct Service

Provided by Business and Labor

- Stride Rite Children's Center

The Stride Rite Center in Boston opened in 1971 to provide child care for Stride Rite employees and the surrounding

community. Since then, the center has grown to accommodate 45 children, from 2 3/4 to 6 years of age, in a 52-week program. The success of the center is attributed to early decisions that called for company sponsorship, parent participation, careful staffing, and outside sources of funding. The Massachusetts Department of Welfare fills approximately 50 percent of the available slots. The Department provides \$47.75 a week per child. Stride Rite employees using the center pay 10 percent of their salaries for this service. The actual cost of providing care is \$54.00 a week; the difference is paid by the Stride Rite Charitable Foundation. The \$100,000 cost for the center's start-up and maintenance over a four-year period was paid by Stride Rite and deducted as a charitable donation.

This is a developmental child care center enhanced by the family environment created by the parents being nearby. All 10 staff have at least bachelor's degrees and student volunteers assist in the classroom. Since the center opened, there has been virtually no staff turnover, which has resulted in program stability, the trust and confidence of parents, and a high degree of credibility in the community.

The cost effectiveness of on-site child care cannot be overlooked. The Stride Rite Center is free to use company utilities and telephone. It has access to the company cafeteria, industrial nurse, repair shop, skilled craftspeople, scrap materials, and recyclables. Particularly helpful is the pool of business skills available to center staff: payroll department, typing, bookkeeping, tax department, auditors, lawyers, personnel department, and computer department. The center also reaches out to the community, and in an effort to reduce the crime problem in the community, has developed job opportunities for youth such as working to install an electrical system in the center.

The success of the Boston Stride Rite Children's Center has generated plans for other centers in Stride Rite plants in Massachusetts, Maine, and Missouri.

● Intermedics

In Freeport, Texas, during the summer of 1978, executives and department supervisors at Intermedics, a manufacturer of electronic devices, met to discuss the problems of tardiness and absenteeism. Providing low paying jobs, they were aware of a morale problem and the prevalence of single parents among their employees. They thought

of child care as a solution to these problems and called in Alice Duncan, a former center director and a conference participant. Ms. Duncan met with interested employees individually on company time to discuss their child care needs. Other community people have become interested in working for Intermedics because of the availability of child care.

The board of Intermedics has made child care a number one priority, enabling the center to open only one year from the time the idea was conceived. There are 250 children being served on \$500,000 per year. The center collects \$5 to \$10 a week from employees as their contribution to their children's care.

- Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union (ACTWU)

In 1966, ACTWU Regional Manager Sam Nocella negotiated an agreement with 45 manufacturers in his five-State region to provide child care services for children of union members. Ten years after the opening of the first center in 1968, six centers have been established with an investment of \$5 million for construction and \$12 million for operation. Serving approximately 1,100 children, these centers are located in Hanover, McConnellsburg, and Chambersburg, Pennsylvania; Verona, and Winchester, Virginia; and Baltimore, Maryland.

ACTWU workers make men's clothing. Prior to World War II, 85 percent of this labor force was men; since then, the work force has become 85 percent women. The garment industry generally is not a high paying industry, and as early as 1923, the union found other ways to provide supports through an unemployment insurance policy and a special Amalgamated Bank in New York that provided loans for their employees.

The funding of the child care centers is unique. The 45 manufacturers are contributing 2 percent of their gross payroll (which is tax deductible) to the union's Health and Welfare Fund. This amount accounts for 66 percent of the cost of operation with the remaining cost assumed by the Child Care Food Program and parent fees. The cost to the union member is \$15 a week for the first child and \$7.50 a week for each additional child in the family. The textile industry work force is currently shrinking due to expanded imports, and the centers have opened their doors to community residents who are charged twice that of union members (\$30). The actual cost of care is assessed at \$55 a week.

The centers are considered developmental in that they address the health, nutritional, social, and educational

growth of the child. Each center has its own clinic, visiting pediatrician, and full time nurse who provide children with annual physicals and proper immunization. The centers interact with the community, benefitting from affiliation with libraries, museums, farms, local colleges and universities, and nursing schools.

The only other ACTWU-sponsored child care program is in Chicago. The 10 year old center serves 50 children with money from the union's Health and Welfare Fund and not from contributing manufacturers as in the other six programs. Before 1978, child care was free for union members. They are currently charged \$10 a week per child, while the program costs \$68 a week to operate. In the early years, it was not uncommon to have a waiting list of 40 to 60 children. The impact of imports again, and a change in the work force to fewer people with young children, have caused the waiting list to disappear.

Manny Tuteur, director of the Amalgamated Center in Chicago said,

The Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union has looked at day care not only as a work-related necessity, but also as a family enriching system.

● Real Estate

There is a benefit to real estate developers in helping provide child care both in industrial parks and in housing developments. They see that local employers want child care as a means of recruiting. Developers can afford to provide child care because either it pays for itself or the employers repay the costs. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey is investing \$.5 billion in three massive industrial parks in an effort to attract businesses. Listed in their brochure as amenities are cheap electricity and child care.

Real estate agents in Fairfax County, Virginia, have also seen the advantages to available child care. They boast about the Fairfax County Office for Children with its information and referral services as a selling point to prospective buyers; in return they contribute funds to the county office.

Provided by the Federal Government

Day care programs and centers in Federal agencies vary widely in scope, numbers served, operation, costs, parent fees, commodities provided by agencies, and authority by which they were established. Nine agencies in the greater Washington area provide employment-related services: the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW), the National Institute of Education (NIE), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the Department of Agriculture (DOA), the Department of Labor (DOL), the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the Social Security Administration (SSA). The Boston Federal Executive Board supported the development of an interagency effort resulting in the formation of the Government Center Child Care Corporation which began a program in February 1978.

In the cases of HEW, NIE, DOL, and EEOC, demonstration/research activities were undertaken in the areas of child development, employee stability, and employee career development goals. A General Accounting Office (GAO) ruling in 1976 held that upon determination that such services were necessary for employee welfare and morale, an agency head could provide a program. HEW and HUD received special Congressional authorization for their centers when they were planning to establish parent/employee operations.

In some instances, management provided the impetus for the program. HEW, NIE, DOL, and EEOC, with assistance from employee and union groups, furnished this type of leadership. SSA, Agriculture, NASA (Goddard Space Center), HUD, and NIH programs were employee-instigated and were operated by a parent board from the start. HEW and HUD both received strong initial support from their Departments' Secretaries. DOL's program was the first government-sponsored child care center and now provides an on-site facility for 100 preschool children aged 18 months to 5 years. Recent efforts to explore the feasibility of developing child care programs within agencies have been spearheaded by Federal Women's Program Coordinators in cooperation with women's caucuses, unions, and other employee groups.

The trend in Federal day care appears to be toward parent operation and control after an initial period of substantial agency involvement. All demonstration centers are now self-sustaining with independent boards of directors responsible for hiring, staffing, and fiscal and operating policies. The government's role is usually limited to providing a facility for the center as it does for other employee activities.

In the legislative branch of government, Senator McGovern has been exploring the possibilities of starting a child care center for the employees of the Senate, House, Library of Congress, and Supreme Court. A survey of the potential

clientele indicated an overwhelming need for infant care and a general dissatisfaction with present arrangements. McGovern's staff have been working with a number of local and national child care organizations and hope to get a center started within the year.

In the judicial branch, we find the provision of drop-in child care. In the newly built District of Columbia Courthouse is housed a child care center for children of defendants, plaintiffs, witnesses, probationers, and jurors. Opened on July 30, 1974, the center is the result of considerable planning and effort by the nonprofit, voluntary Friends of the Superior Court, local church groups, child care advocates, and the D.C. Department of Human Resources.

The center attempts to ease some of the pain and inconvenience for people involved in the judicial process. For most people having business with the court there is no alternative to bringing their children with them. Too often children are used to elicit sympathy from the judge or jury which is unhealthy for the children and disturbing to their parents. The drop-in center enables parents and court staff to be relieved of supervisory problems and offers children a stimulating program that takes into account the possibility of emotional stress resulting from their exposure to a crisis situation.

The center is open from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and serves children 18 months to 14 years old. Parents may bring children at any time and for as long as they have court business. The service is free to parents; it is paid for by the D.C. courts. There is no advance registration requirement so the staff cannot anticipate how many or what age children they will serve on any particular day. Although limited by licensing laws to a maximum of 20 children, the intermittent care they provide has enabled them to serve as many as 30 children on a given day.

Snacks are provided and when lunch has not been brought by parents, it also is provided by the center. Children are given brief health inspections before they enter the center and admittance is refused if a child is considered too ill. Free health and screening services are provided periodically to test for lead poisoning, dental health, and speech and hearing deficiency.

When the center was being planned, some felt it need be nothing more than a babysitting service. The director, however, felt that every moment of a child's life should be of high quality. To that end, individualized attention

is provided by a staff trained in early childhood education and child development. The staff also includes volunteers--senior citizens, youth, and lawyers' spouses--and CETA enrollees. Training is provided for all staff.

Similar efforts to provide child care on a drop-in basis in cooperation with the courts are occurring in Brooklyn, New York City, and Los Angeles; Chicago and Boston courts are considering the possibility. The success of the D.C. Superior Court child care center and the media coverage it has attracted have provided the impetus for these other efforts.

Provided by Public Schools

- The Brookline Extended Day Program

The eight elementary schools in Brookline, Massachusetts, sponsor parent-designed and parent-run, nonprofit, after-school programs. Care is provided for children from kindergarten through fourth grade in the school they attend during the day. For children from kindergarten through eighth grade, specialists from the schools or the community provide activities and classes in crafts, art and music, languages, and so forth.

Parents are responsible for fiscal policy, fundraising, staff hiring, program content, and admissions. Most have formed an executive committee or board on which the school principal sits as an ex-officio member so that s/he may work closely with parents and staff. Approval for a program must be given by Brookline's elected school committee.

The after-school programs incorporate as nonprofit institutions in order to reduce personal liability, to become exempt from some taxes, and to facilitate funding from State and private agencies and foundations. Most programs sought the help of a lawyer for this process, some of whom donated their services.

The programs operate for 10 months of the year and may be open as late as 5:30 p.m. depending on the needs of parents and the fiscal stability of the program. Fees range from \$15 to \$25 a week, and may be based on a flat rate or on a sliding scale according to income. Some scholarship money is available in a few of the programs.

Tuitions, donated funds, and third party payments (welfare funds) pay for the cost of staff salaries, fringe benefits

(if any), equipment and supplies, transportation for trips, food, telephone, insurance, legal fees, and scholarships. Rent, utilities, and custodial services are provided as in-kind contributions by the public schools. During vacations or on snow days, the Brookline programs may use school space and are then responsible for covering part of the custodial costs.

The programs seek staff with a diversity of expertise and attempt a balance of sex, age, and parent/non-parent status. Work-study students, volunteers, Neighborhood Youth Corps workers, teenagers, and social work students from local colleges also assist in the programs. Salaries are slightly higher than those for caregivers in other preschool child care programs, primarily due to limited overhead costs. In-service training and workshops are provided by local consultants. A teacher-director is responsible for developing a liaison with regular classroom teachers in the schools as well as for program planning and coordination.

Information is available from Brookline on how to establish an after-school program in your community.

Provided by the Academic Community

In 1977, the Center for Women's Opportunities at the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges surveyed 1,400, two-year and technical institutions and found only 132 with child care facilities on campus. The National Council on Campus Child Care has a listing of 750 child care programs operating at four-year institutions. Most of the facilities are located in teacher education or early childhood development programs or laboratories. Waiting lists frequently are long. Although fees are calculated on a sliding scale, child care allowances seldom are included in the student/parents' financial aid packages. College and university administrators reluctant to provide child care services cite fears about licensing problems, accident insurance, and sharply rising institutional support costs. Information is available from the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges on how to create child care programs on college campuses.

Recent efforts to integrate the needs of parents and children in the academic community have been difficult to staff and fund. Schools in many States have been slow to change rules to permit single mothers to stay in regular classes during pregnancy and to return to regular classes after delivery, bringing the infant to school for child care. Only a handful of school districts have developed courses that use an infant care program to instruct parents in child development, nutrition, and

parental skills as part of a career development plan.

Provided by Local Agencies

• YWCA, Jamestown, New York

The YWCA of Jamestown, New York, provides child care services to 130 infants and toddlers, preschoolers, and school-age children ranging in ages from 8 weeks to 12 years, and has a subsidiary relationship with programs operating in nursery schools, family day care systems, and shopping centers. Services are offered from 6:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, all year. "Neither snow, sleet, hail, nor gas crisis closes the center." The center participates in the Child Care Food Program and provides developmental care for the children. The director, Sandra Dower, attributes much of the success of the program to John Eldred and the Labor-Management Committee which chose to focus on child care as a quality of life issue for Jamestown citizens in dealing with the economic problems they face.

• Child's Play, Inc.

Alexa Robinson is a mother who was frustrated when trying to find quality child care convenient to work. Her solution was to establish a center in the downtown business district of Washington, D.C. where child care is virtually nonexistent.

She established Child's Play, Inc. with a small business loan from a very receptive Women's National Bank, developed a curriculum and promotional materials, and prepared to renovate a downtown building. With everything in place, the building inspector decided that renovations would not bring the building into compliance. Convinced of the necessity for a downtown child care program, Child's Play is looking for a new site.

Ms. Robinson received an overwhelming response to an ad placed in Washington newspapers. Hundreds of parents found the idea of commuting with their children in rush hour not as unpleasant a prospect as the research indicates. Generally, parents are supposed to prefer child care close to their home rather than place of work. If a demand for downtown child care persists, building codes may have to be altered to take into consideration the ways in which downtown buildings can be converted to maintain safety standards and provide a much needed child care service. New office buildings could have child care space built in, providing building owners and managers with a built-in selling point for prospective renters.

• The Spanish Education Development Center (SED)

The SED Center is a unique educational center located in the heart of the Spanish-speaking community of Washington, D.C. It was founded in 1971 when a group of community leaders and parents joined together to establish child care services, and has become the first bilingual, bicultural preschool in Washington, D.C.

The SED program helps 50 children between the ages of 3 and 5 develop the academic, physical, social, and emotional skills necessary to succeed in first grade. The program also helps the families of these children find more effective ways of using available resources, alternative ways of dealing with immediate problem situations, and ways for parents to be more actively involved in their children's education.

The success of the preschool program and the growth and diversification of the population helped the SED Center expand its clientele to include the entire family. It provides a Bilingual Bicultural Tutorial program after school and during the summer months for 200 children between the ages of 6 and 13. Classes are held in the public schools and focus on supplementary academic, cultural, and recreational activities. The SED Center's Talent Search Program works to help young people between the ages of 14 and 27 finish high school and pursue postsecondary training. The program provides career counseling, financial aid information, and assistance with applications, admissions, and testing procedures. A CETA grant enabled this program to compile a directory of vocation-related resources in the Washington Metropolitan area. The Adult Community Education Program serves more than 125 adults who want to learn English. Workshops on the acculturation process are also conducted.

SED Center staff have undergone extensive training and evaluation with assistance provided by the East Harlem Block Schools in New York. They have also submitted to the Community Services Administration a joint proposal with the University of Pittsburgh for a study of the Spanish-speaking community in Washington, D.C., to better determine and meet the needs of their client population. The SED Center has not only reached out to its own community for support, but to other communities where efforts have been tried and were successful.

• The Rosemont Center

In 1889, the House of Mercy was established by the Association for Works of Mercy in an attempt to meet the

needs of unwed mothers. In 1972, an evaluation of the changing needs of the community provided the incentive for a newly formed corporation devoted to infant and child day care. The House of Mercy renovated the building and expanded the program to include 134 infants and preschoolers in a totally integrated bilingual program known as the Rosemont Center.

Infant care is provided in the Center and through a system of licensed family day care homes. Family day care providers are given training at the Rosemont Center and receive ongoing training supports as needed. The Center is also used as a demonstration site for the training of a variety of professionals and paraprofessionals needed in child care programs. Schools and colleges use the Center for field service courses and join in in-service staff training.

A social worker is available for parents and staff. Special social, emotional, and health needs of the children are identified and the social worker helps with necessary referrals. The health and safety of the children are further monitored by a professional nurse, who provides screening, instructs the children in personal hygiene, teaches family day care mothers to observe signs of illnesses, and aids parents in seeking additional medical advice when necessary.

Nearly two-thirds of operating costs are provided by the D.C. Department of Human Resources. The remaining third is raised from private sources, half of which is from parent fees.

Indirect Service

Many community solutions for child care involve improving the quality and efficiency of existing programs, helping new programs get started, helping parents find appropriate care for their children, and educating parents about community resources. The community solutions described below are provided by brokers who offer technical assistance, training, information and referral, and parent education.

Technical Assistance and Training

- Fairfax County Office for Children

The Fairfax County Office for Children is a government agency responsible for the coordination of county efforts

to provide out-of-home child care. It was established by the Board of Supervisors in 1975 on the basis of a recommendation from a citizen group asked to look at the county's child care programs.

Fairfax county has a population of 700,000 people, 80 child care centers, and an estimated 18,000 to 25,000 children in need of care. Judy Rosen, director of the Office for Children, found that the cost to the fee-paying parent is the same in a Title XX program or in a privately-owned child care center. "People who need child care, get child care. But what's the quality?"

In hopes of answering that question, the Office for Children concentrates on improving the quality of all available care through training of caregivers to improve the quality of staff, and public information to show parents how to evaluate the quality of programs. The Office works with parents in selecting appropriate child care. It also provides financial assistance for child care to low and moderate income families.

The county office offers guidance to those interested in starting programs, and sponsors an extended day program, offering before-and after-school care in county elementary schools.

- Volunteer Urban Consultants

This New York-based firm provides business consultation to nonprofit, minority organizations. It began in 1972 with the support of Federal funds as the Business Resource Center for New York City. It relies on graduates from the Harvard Business School to become volunteers to help with problems in nonprofit organizations. Volunteer Urban Consultants provides free consulting services dealing with insurance, personnel policies, accounting techniques, and architecture. At present, there are 900 M.B.A. volunteers who offer these free services, many of whom are beginning to work with child care programs.

- Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) of Central Florida

The 4-C concept was developed in 1969 and tested in numerous agencies around the country. Federal funding for these programs was eliminated in 1973, but some of the more successful agencies are thriving today. One of the more dynamic efforts is the 4-C of Central Florida, located in Orlando.

The Florida 4-C is dedicated to involvement of the entire community. It promotes the delivery of services without segregation of children or families on the basis of need. 4-C accomplishes this by stimulating the use of existing private centers, both for-profit and nonprofit. 4-C's view is that public funds should not be used to operate centers, but to enable parents to purchase their own child care. As stated in 4-C's program description:

...to use buildings solely for children of low income is costly and nonproductive. If low income parents are converted into fee paying customers by our assistance, services become available to meet the need at the individual service provider's expense for capital outlay and start-up costs. So, cost to the program is less for each child in this form of assistance than the per child cost of operating programs solely for needy children. This lower per child cost is an added benefit.

Phoebe Carpenter, 4-C director, adds:

If the standards are set for the publicly funded child so that program costs are substantially more than is the going rate for the privately paying child in the same community, you're going to see an end to public funding for child care. It's also philosophically wrong to segregate the welfare child into specially subsidized programs and serve only a few, when you could, with the same money, serve more children.

When parents are unable to afford the cost of care, 4-C contributes directly to the caretaker. If parents are enabled, through 4-C, to pay the cost of care at the center of their choice, perhaps competition among centers to get that business will stimulate improved quality.

4-C sponsors monthly meetings for center directors to provide information and share resources. A Paraprofessional Training Program provides courses for child care workers and parents on child development skills and activities. Coca Cola provides some of the money for this training. With financial and volunteer support from the Junior League, 4-C operates a toy library. It also sponsors tours of child care centers for interested community members and, in cooperation with 53 community programs, an annual Festival for Children attended by approximately 6,000

children and their families. It is a carnival without food or money, intended to educate the public about children's needs.

4-C also provides technical assistance to people interested in opening child care centers and maintains an information and referral service for parents in need of child care. Through their Health and Social Services effort, 4-C serves as a communications link between families and agencies, child care centers, and other programs to help reduce overlapping services.

- FOCAL

A group of child care providers, parents, and concerned citizens met in Selma, Alabama, in 1972 to seek cooperation and resources from the State for child care services. This group of 10 centers and 60 individuals established the Federation of Community-Controlled Centers of Alabama (FOCAL). Today, FOCAL is a statewide organization of 85 child care centers, 160 family day care homes and over 700 individual members, that touches the lives of nearly 5,500 children.

FOCAL's goals are to assist programs in providing quality child care, protect and support the interests of independent child care centers, and raise a powerful and influential voice in the decision-making process on behalf of low income and minority children. To this end, FOCAL invests its energy in three program components: training, technical assistance, and advocacy.

The training program attempts to develop skills and improve the level of confidence and professionalism of those working with children. It also assists providers in meeting State requirements for training and certification and encourages them to obtain credits and degrees in child development and related studies. Workshops are held regularly led by prominent politicians, community leaders, and child care advocates from all over the country. To meet the special needs of FOCAL members, most training is scheduled on weekends and in various sites around the State.

FOCAL's technical assistance is designed to give help in starting and effectively managing programs through training in hiring and firing of staff; preparing incorporation papers; fundraising; board selection; and interpreting regulations, standards, and State and Federal forms. By encouraging members to request training relevant to their needs, many problems are solved through the training program.

The strength of FOCAL emanates from its role as a voice for the people needing and providing child care throughout the State. The Federation has seen that public agencies often are reluctant to offer poor people a voice in developing and managing programs affecting their lives and the lives of their children. Advocacy efforts concentrate on representing the FOCAL viewpoint to State agencies through participation in State, regional, and national advocacy efforts; testifying on legislation; serving on policy-making bodies; publishing a bi-monthly advocacy newsletter; and creating media presentations. At another level, FOCAL serves as an advocate for providers as they interact with Pensions and Security Departments, Health Departments, fire inspectors, and licensing officials.

Through these efforts, FOCAL has provided the people of Alabama with an incentive for speaking out and taking advantage of the community resources available to them. Their self-initiated community solutions have also fostered a sense of pride and self-worth among the individuals and families concerned about child care.

• Work-Education Councils

In order for youth to experience a smoother transition from school to work, the National Manpower Institute believes, community-level support is required from business, labor, education, and government. Through the collaborative efforts of these sectors, NMI has helped create over the past three years, work-education councils in 31 communities and 2 States. Responsibility and leadership have been shared by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the National Alliance of Business, while funding comes from the Office of Youth Programs in the U.S. Department of Labor.

Councils have found that they can raise financial support within the community, develop effective programs for youth, and through a consortium of councils, can help each other.

Mike Lyden from the Education-Work Council of Erie City and County, Pennsylvania, calls the councils unique in that they "comprise individuals who are concerned with problems that bridge or sometimes fall between the purview, jurisdictions, or scopes of our major institutions."

Work-education councils are recognized as neutral forums and have attracted new concerns and ideas to be explored. Several have recently put child care on their agendas.

They have seen that employers are concerned with the retention of young women they have recently brought into skilled blue-collar trades and that provision of child care may be a way to retain these women in the work force. A work-education council as a collaborative mechanism may be as appropriate to link the concerns of working parents and child care as it is for youth and employment.

Information and Referral

• The Child Care Switchboard

The phone rings about 40 times a day at the San Francisco offices of the Child Care Switchboard with calls from parents who are in need of child care services. Since 1973, the Switchboard has been providing free services that can help meet these parents' needs.

The Switchboard offers a Single Parent Resource Center designed to help single parent families create and strengthen support systems. There are peer support groups, special services to single pregnant women and new single mothers, a shared housing file, special referrals, family recreational materials, and a library of resource materials.

The Switchboard's Toy Center provides toys that are low cost, safe, and educational. The Center has workshops on how to make toys and has a toy lending library.

The Family Day Care Unit helps people start child care programs in their homes by providing workshops and orientation to the licensing process. The Family Day Care Law Project helps enhance the viability and credibility of family day care providers and generally assists them with legal struggles.

Child care center staff meet in monthly forums to discuss common concerns and learn about policies that may affect their programs. The Switchboard also provides a job referral bank for child care workers and administrators.

Recognizing the significant impact of policy decisions on the child care market, the Switchboard and its never-tiring director, Patti Siegel, are important advocates for child care in San Francisco. Meeting with other agencies, monitoring legislation, and testifying are their chief political activities. All programs and events related to child care nationally and in San

Francisco are reported in the Switchboard's bi-monthly newsletter, "Children's News Advocate."

The primary activity of the Child Care Switchboard is its information and referral (I & R) service. Four I & R counselors tend the phone from 10:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. each day. Counselors, drawing from the files, recommend public and private day care centers, babysitters, family day care homes, parent co-ops, and playgroups. They know what is available for infants, preschoolers, and school-age children. They also provide welfare counseling and legal advice.

The Switchboard has a sophisticated data collection system (described in more detail on page 49) whereby information about every call or drop-in visit is recorded on an intake card. After six weeks, the Switchboard follows up each referral to determine the parent's success in making child care arrangements. The feedback enables the Switchboard to evaluate itself, update files, and find out what obstacles prevented satisfactory arrangements from being made. The data are also used to document the need for child care in San Francisco and help legislators develop and evaluate child care legislation.

The Switchboard is a unique I & R agency: not only has it helped thousands of parents find care for their children and made a case for maintaining the level of State funding after Proposition 13, but it has provided the impetus for the creation of 34 I & R agencies now operating in the State of California. They operate within an informal network and collectively provide the documentation of unmet child care needs throughout the State.

- The Day Care and Child Development Council of Tompkins County

Over 2,000 families with preschool and school-aged children in upstate New York rely on this county-wide child care consultation service each year. The DCCDC of Tompkins County provides information and referral services, resources, and cooperative planning for those concerned with children and families.

In its information and referral role, the Council matches parents' requests with more than 50 child care programs and 100 family day care homes. Special attention is given to sick and handicapped children and those whose parents work at odd hours. The Council also

has a scholarship program that provides for short-term, emergency child care for single parents or families with special problems and needs.

The Gathering Place is the Council's resource center that makes available to organizations, programs, and parents inexpensive and free materials, ideas, training, and consultation in all aspects of child development programming and policy.

The Council is supported by United Way, the Department of Social Services, the Division for Youth, Head Start, and local citizens. The Council also uses the resources of Cornell University. This support enables the Council to serve parents, providers, legislators, employers, community groups, and public and private agencies and provides a vehicle for cooperation and joint planning for meeting child care needs at the county level.

Parent Education

● Texas Child Care '76

Texas Child Care '76 is an outgrowth of the Day Care and Child Development Council's Bicentennial effort. No longer affiliated with the Day Care Council, the primary goal of Texas Child Care '76 is to educate and enable adults to articulate the needs of children and to provide parents and concerned citizens with the tools that can help them be effective participants in the decision-making process.

In promoting public awareness and advocacy to strengthen families, Texas Child Care '76 provided leadership in the formation of the Texas Title XX Coalition. It also publishes "Texas Child Care Reports," a monthly newsletter on policies affecting children and families. "Middle Road Traveler" is a junior high school level educational television series that raises thought-provoking issues facing parents today.

One of Texas Child Care's most successful efforts is Noon Time Seminars, hour long programs offered at business sites to bring together working parents to share their family concerns. The Seminars began in 1976 as a Bicentennial project in cooperation with the Texas Department of Public Welfare. Working parent forums were held in 10 communities and were co-sponsored by local volunteer groups that provide services to children and families. Three years later, after an overwhelming

response from parents, Noon Time Seminars are conducted in 20 Texas communities. The cooperating businesses include Southwestern Bell, Houston Gas, J.C. Penney, Levi Strauss, a life insurance company, a hospital, City Hall, and the social services division of the Department of Public Welfare.

Seminars are conducted on such topics as Parent/Child Relationships, Community Resources, and Quality Child Care. Each seminar is independent and can be held singly or they can be combined into a series. Texas Child Care '76 trains community volunteers to serve as facilitators in the seminars.

Some parents have formed self-help groups as a result of their experience in Noon Time Seminars. They have also uncovered cases of child abuse, providing counseling and preventing further abuse.

Texas Child Care '76 hopes to expand the seminars further and stimulate corporate interest in the problems faced by children and families.

- Clayton Early Childhood Program

Barbara Geno of Clayton, Missouri, has developed a series of parent education seminars similar to those of Texas Child Care '76. With funds from the State 4-C program, the Clayton program offers seminars in the public schools and sponsors a Lunch Bunch where parents and children come to talk about their problems and needs. The program covers a range of topics that follow the development of the child from before birth through school. The program has been particularly useful to the junior high and high school students who participate. The learning that occurs in seminars is reinforced through home visits and individual counseling.

The favorable publicity received by the Clayton Early Childhood Program had reached the business community so that when Ms. Geno approached corporations to see if they, too, would sponsor parent education seminars for their employees, they responded positively. Employers are currently paying 20 percent of the cost of Brown Bag Seminars with the remainder of the money coming from the home economics departments of neighborhood high schools as part of their career planning program. When parent/employees are asked to evaluate the seminars and describe other areas of need, they constantly mention child care facilities. This information has been relayed to employers, who have used it to solicit funding from the Chamber of Commerce for the establishment of a child

care center. The center will be housed in the public schools and will serve employees from a number of corporations as well as community residents.

Special Solutions for Special Problems

The philosophies, life styles, and special needs of parents seeking child care are often frustrated by the current child care system. Some communities have developed solutions and some are still looking for solutions. Concerns about the sick child, sex stereotyping, transportation, and for-profit child care are discussed below.

The Sick Child

One of the greatest fears of working parents is that their children will get sick...and inevitably they do. This concern was raised many times throughout the conference.

Jan Yocum not only had suggestions, but two tried and true solutions. One of the Wichita Day Care Association's programs trains CETA employees as nurses' aides to care for sick children in their own homes. The other program, funded by private funds, Title XX, and CETA, established emergency family day care homes where only sick children are cared for. The program started with 10 family day care homes and now has 50. (All available spaces are always filled.) Some of the family day care homes have formed satellites around child care centers or public schools. A registered nurse, funded by United Way, supervises these programs and the children.

Miriam Kertzman from Stride Rite acknowledged the problems parents face when their children become ill. The Stride Rite center does keep sick children.* There is an isolation room and the industrial nurse is on the premises. Center staff do not give the children medication, but rather have the parent come in--a definite benefit of on-site child care provided by industry.

The center at Intermedics has a nurse on staff to care for infants and to assume responsibility for sick children and give immunizations when needed.

The Family Circle survey found the same concerns raised about sick children. Their findings show that two out of

* This practice is based on a study by Duke University that found no difference in the incidence of respiratory illnesses between children reared at home and those cared for in a child care program.

three mothers find that the only solution is to stay home. Only one mother in seven reports that her husband shares sick-child care. Many suggested sick-child care leave granted by the employer to save parents from having to use vacation time to care for their sick children.

Sex Role Stereotyping

The low salaries of child care workers generally discourage men from entering the field. Conferees were concerned that many young children, especially those from female-headed households, see only women in caregiving roles. There was also concern about curriculum materials and books that reinforce this stereotyping. (The low salaries also say quite a lot about the value our society places on caring for children.)

Transportation

Transportation is generally a bigger problem for rural than for urban communities because programs are spread out and the community often already is plagued with inadequate public transportation. Nowhere do Federal subsidies allow for the cost of transportation and rarely are programs designed with the availability of public transportation in mind. A car is a necessity for parents who live in one part of town, have their child care in another section, and their jobs in still a third, and in many areas there is inadequate parking for these working, commuting, child care-arranging parents.

For-profit Child Care

Dick Tritter addressed what he felt was one of the major structural problems in the child care system: "the war between for-profit and nonprofit child care facilities." When the altruists in child care think of making money off of children, they conjure up images of "Kentucky Fried Children." But Mr. Tritter points out that very often those taking home salaries from nonprofit programs earn more than staff in profit making programs. A large sector of the profit making providers, in fact, make no profit.

Phoebe Carpenter pointed out the racial and income segregation of children that results from not taking advantage of the care provided by for-profit programs. The attitudes toward for-profits on the part of nonprofits only work to decrease the availability and quality of care, and reduce parent choice as well.

ADVOCATING COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS FOR CHILD CARE

Developing a Coalition Constituency

Between January and March 1979, Senator Jacob Javits from New York received 200 letters opposing the Child Care Act of 1979 (S.4). He received one letter supporting the legislation. It is true that "no!" is usually uttered more loudly than "yes," but one must remember that a silent "yes" also sounds like a "no."

S.4 was the third attempt in the past nine years to pass legislation to provide comprehensive child care. While political and economic forces were at play, the advocacy community was not. Advocates are often their own worst enemies and in relation to comprehensive child care legislation, they were as much responsible for its defeat as they were for its introduction.

Willard Wirtz, former Secretary of Labor and currently Chairman of the Board of the National Manpower Institute, presented a thought-provoking set of suggestions for building a coalition constituency in support of child care. He chose not to discuss why advocates support child care, but why others do not. One reason is philosophical--the fear that further institutionalization of child care outside the home may weaken the family, as President Nixon warned in his message vetoing comprehensive child care in 1970. The second reason is economic: who is going to pay for child care? He noted that the conversation usually stops altogether at that point.

One way of dealing with the philosophical objection may be with semantics. While some might think semantics trivial, Mr. Wirtz reminded conferees of a seeming correlation between bad policy-making and good phraseology: "fair trade laws," "right to work laws," "right to life." He is concerned that the phrase "child care program" may be too threatening to those who feel child care is the central function of the family. Mr. Wirtz's suggestion for a replacement is "extended child care," which seems to suggest the extended family and honestly reflects the purpose of child care: to "extend the family concept to include the community."

Mr. Wirtz also advised advocates to better identify the components of a constituency to support child care. As discussed earlier, conferees agreed that extended child care should not be perceived as a women's issue.

Mr. Wirtz suggested that men may see involvement in child care advocacy and solutions "as a chance for masculine dolts to atone for at least one of our sins." Also, by narrowly targeting child care concerns, to only the poor for instance, it becomes harder to develop a broad enough coalition for change. He feels that "child care has a great deal to lose from getting mixed--as it already is to some extent--with poverty and welfare programs, and much more to gain from being identified with the idea of improving the quality of life in general."

In response to the query "who is going to pay?", Mr. Wirtz considered government and employers. But "billing the government means higher taxes and billing employers means higher prices, and a coalition constituency that leaves out taxpayers and consumers won't even get on the agenda."

Mr. Wirtz suggested several possibilities for maximizing affirmative support for extended child care: 1) working to protect the \$200 million earmarked for child care in Title XX; 2) increasing the tax credit for work-related child care expenses; 3) putting extended child care on the collective bargaining agenda ("our authentic tradition has been that this affords a valuable testing ground for working out new ideas--or new forms of old ideas."); 4) placing a stronger emphasis on the relationship between child care and alternative, more flexible work schedules, particularly in the provision of part-time jobs; and 5) trying to cost out child care to put a value on increased productivity and reduced absenteeism. Also recommended was allocating the costs of extended child care on the basis of the benefits received to enable some margin of cost to be handled on a straight "needs" basis that could avoid appearing as another multi-billion dollar add-on to taxes and prices.

Mr. Wirtz suggested that efforts to build a coalition constituency depend not on speeches, but on the stimulation of activities at the local level. One of the critical keys involves the establishment of organizational structures to facilitate community-based extended child care. Mr. Wirtz noted, too, that we need to learn how to rely on professionals and volunteers; we rely too little on the rapidly growing senior class; and don't rely at all on labor unions.

Tools for Advocacy

Two important tools for advocacy are cooperation and information. We have seen the benefits of working with other community groups and establishing linkages and networks. We now take a look at the information resources at our disposal.

The Importance of Data

Data and information presented in the right form can greatly enhance cooperative efforts. Advocates often are not familiar with available data and would not know how to use it if they were. They paid the price in 1975 when a Stanford Research Institute report was released denying the need for further investment of Federal dollars in child care centers. Advocates responded with rhetoric rather than research and their attack was that much less effective. Part of the problem in obtaining research data is that it is not widely circulated, except in scholarly journals. Access to it by advocates is limited due to its "artificial dissemination."

The problem with using the research, if found, is that it is invariably laden with academic jargon and does not relate findings to their policy implications; it is up to advocates to translate the data. Some efforts are under way to correct this problem such as the Bush Foundation's funding of four policy centers on Child Development and Public Policy at Yale, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina, and UCLA. The National Academy of Sciences has developed the National Committee on Child Development Research and Public Policy, now in its second year. The Society for Research in Child Development has also begun advocating more policy-related research through the establishment of a Washington liaison office and an active Social Policy Committee.

Dana Friedman, a child care consultant in Washington, D.C., conducted a national survey of child development research and found a significant lack of research on important administrative and cost issues. It is important for the advocacy community to work with researchers and inform them of their data needs.

Child care advocates are constantly called upon to justify the existence of their programs and to describe the scope of unmet needs. If the data are not available, there are creative ways for the advocates themselves to compile data.

- Collecting Data While Educating Parents

The Noon Time Seminars sponsored by Texas Child Care '76 provide invaluable data that Child Care '76 uses for advocacy. All employees who participate in seminars are asked to complete questionnaires that address their family structures and needs. Texas Child Care '76 now has a profile of self-expressed parental needs from 14 communities. The data are used to influence public policy issues in the State and to develop a dialogue with corporate management, since the responses come from working parents. Parent evaluations of the Brown Bag Seminars at corporations in Clayton, Missouri, have also been used to convince employers of the need for a new child care center in the community.

- Collecting Data Through Information and Referral

The sophisticated intake and follow-up procedures of the Child Care Switchboard in San Francisco have provided timely and accurate data on need, including supply, demand, use, and preference. The data have helped legislators in developing policy and programs, and have helped create four new infant centers in San Francisco. The six-week follow-up telephone call allows the Switchboard to evaluate itself, which, when favorable (as it is), can be used for fundraising purposes. The call also allows parents time to talk. The Switchboard discovered that 22 percent of the parents could not find child care because there were no openings; 19 percent said care is too expensive; and 64 percent who could not find child care stayed home.

- The Census Bureau

One of our most underused data resources is the Census Bureau. Doreen Spilton, from the Statistical Research Division of the Census Bureau, described the services offered by the Bureau that could be helpful to child care advocates. Data generally can be used to identify potential users of child care and to determine how to allocate limited funds.

All census data are available to the public in reports and on computer tapes. Data are kept on file over the years so that a historical record is available to identify trends and estimate future demand. Data are also available for small geographic units, such as counties, townships, and census tracts--parts of cities that are socio-economically homogeneous. Information can be found for as small an area as a city block. The Bureau is planning to have 1980 census data by neighborhoods.

It is now accepting requests from specific neighborhoods that wish to participate. Requests must be received by December 1980 and will be screened. This kind of data would be instrumental in lobbying city councils, for example.

In order to use the data for decisions about financial allocations, the Bureau has a computer program that can link disparate data for the same geographic unit to depict patterns of supply and demand. This is necessary because the data on demand (numbers of children) come from census tracts and the data on supply (availability of child care), provided by State welfare agencies, are listed by school districts. The Census Bureau will provide technical assistance to local groups who bring them data on supply to match it with demand. For a fee the Bureau will also analyze the data for a local group.

The Census Bureau can generate data in many forms--maps, tables, graphics, etc. This service is available to the public and can help display data in an easy-to-understand format.

The resources available from the Bureau are almost innumerable. Undoubtedly one of the most useful services is in the division that is entirely devoted to helping people find and use data. There are subject people who know their issues, are familiar with data available from the Bureau and from other government agencies, and at what level of detail. The Bureau's listing of "Telephone Contacts for Data Users" is attached in appendix VI.

Media

Media use can be effective in two ways: 1) work with the press provides free advertising and reaches a broad audience; and 2) creation of audio-visual presentations can be particularly persuasive.

If prominent officials and politicians in the community are invited to a program, the press should know about it. It is newsworthy and promotes public education at little cost to the program. Establishing relationships with the press can be useful in helping place articles about a program in more important sections of a paper or magazine. Jan Yocum found that too often articles about child care appear along with the obituary column, and could be placed more appropriately in the business and finance section, especially if the program is

described as an economic benefit to the community.

The Child Care Switchboard; Day Care and Child Development Council of Tompkins County, New York; and Texas Child Care '76 have successfully used slide presentations and films describing their programs and the need for them, when approaching legislators, foundations, and businesses to seek their support.

Child care programs in Greensboro, North Carolina, have jointly purchased billboard space along the highways to convey the importance of child care to commuters.

National Advocacy Organizations

In addition to monitoring legislation and reporting information about it to their constituencies, many of the national groups in Washington are establishing networks of community people. They strive for two-way communications networks. Information is sent to the field and circulated through local networks to be used in organizing campaigns to influence policy decisions affecting programs. Grassroots organizations can provide information to Washington through the national organization and can ensure that the advocacy positions of the national groups are reflective of the concerns raised by those affected by the policies.

The Children's Foundation (CF) is one such organization whose director, Barbara Bode, delivered a keynote speech at the conference. The Children's Foundation uses child care food programs as an organizing handle for developing quality child care programs and enhancing other children's services in the community.

After a series of successful lobbying efforts aimed at the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Child Care Food Program, CF managed to increase reimbursement rates and acquire open-ended funding for the program. Child care centers, however, were still not taking advantage of the Child Care Food Program. CF is conducting a national survey of 33,000 licensed day care facilities to find out why. The Foundation has launched a Child Care Food Program Mobilization Campaign to identify centers that do not participate and help them apply for funds.

In 1975, CF concentrated lobbying efforts on family day care and helped get legislation passed that enables family day care homes to participate in the Child Care Food Program through non-profit association sponsors. (Most

family day care homes are not tax-exempt, nor are they equipped to handle complex application and bookkeeping requirements.) With funds from the Levi Strauss Foundation CF has been encouraging the development of these non-profit associations to serve as food sponsors for neighborhood family day care homes. The overwhelmingly positive response CF received from community groups has generated additional interest in upgrading the quality of other aspects of family day care programs. The associations provide training in nutrition education, but also in financial management and planning. In some communities they have found ways to associate with local colleges for child development training.

CF has worked with Texas Child Care '76 and FOCAL, helping to organize these associations. The United Church of Christ has provided funds for a six-month effort in South Carolina to organize family day care associations. CETA workers have been helping with outreach, alerting family day care providers to the availability of food subsidies. This outreach has grown into an effort to help unlicensed providers meet licensing standards so they can participate. In an effort to share the experiences of family day care providers from across the country, CF has developed a provider-run Advisory Board for the Family Day Care Advocacy Project.

Other national organizations that focus on different aspects of child care and that provide unique resources for people at the community level are listed in appendix V.

SUMMARY

Recommendations for action were offered throughout the conference. Many of the suggestions were specific to local community solutions for providing child care and have appeared throughout this report.

Some broader recommendations to the sponsors for sharing those local solutions and for building a larger constituency for child care were voiced during the concluding session.

Suggestions included the development of a "how-to" manual for businesses and labor unions interested in providing child care supports. It also was recommended that the sponsors hold meetings with union leaders and corporate executives to educate them about the issues and to solicit their support.

Other recommended publications included guides to multi-source funding, use of data, and advocacy strategies.

The participants and sponsors agreed that this conference provided an opportunity for the exchange of ideas and practical strategies among people who often don't meet at all, and certainly don't meet around a common issue. This realization suggested the need for a network that would connect the various constituencies involved with child care from different vantage points.

In response to these recommendations, the National Manpower Institute will be exploring the development of a "how-to" manual on community solutions for child care. It would guide users through assessing the need in a community, to using the data gathered to develop solutions and convince community leaders of the validity of those solutions, to the practicalities of applying for funding and keeping financial records.

A second commitment of the National Manpower Institute is to look into the establishment of a center on community solutions for child care that would provide the linkages among communities, between communities and the Federal and State governments, and between communities and the private sector. Participants agreed such a service is sorely lacking.

The voiced commitment of conference sponsors and shared enthusiasm of participants seem capable of producing

action on these recommendations and moving us forward--to better care for our children--to greater community responsibility for that care--through increased community solutions for child care.

REFERENCES

1. Working Mothers and Their Children, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau, 1977. Washington, D.C.
2. U.S. Working Women: A Databook, 1977, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1977. Washington, D.C.
3. An Overview of Women in the Workforce, Factsheet prepared by the National Commission on Working Women, 1978. Washington, D.C.
4. U.S. Working Women: A Databook, 1977, Op Cit.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Working Mothers and Their Children, Op Cit.
9. National Day Care Study, Preliminary Findings and Their Implications, Abt Associates, January 1978. Cambridge, Massachusetts. p. 21.
10. Ibid., p. 40.
11. Testimony of Arabella Martinez, Assistant Secretary for Office of Human Development Services, HEW, before the Subcommittee on Child and Human Development, Committee on Human Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., February 20, 1978.
12. National Day Care Study, Op Cit.
13. Arthur Emlen, "Slogan, Slots and Slander: The Myth of the Day Care Need," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 43 (1), January, 1973.
14. Ed Zigler and Karen Anderson, "Foundation Support in the Child and Family Life Field," Philanthropy Monthly, January, 1979, p. 12-15.

15. Researching Child Care for Public Policy, Report by Dana Friedman, Coalition for Children and Youth, to be released by the National Institute of Mental Health in 1979.
16. Kathryn Senn Perry, Survey and Analysis of Employer-Sponsored Day Care in the U.S., Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1978. Available from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, No. 79-05048. Additional information from Dr. Perry, 5346 N. Hollywood Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53217.

APPENDIX I

The tables in appendix I are taken from Childcare and Preschool, Options for Federal Support, Congressional Budget Office, September 1978.

TABLE 1. METHODS OF CARE FOR CHILDREN UNDER 14 YEARS OLD UTILIZED BY FAMILIES USING MORE THAN 10 HOURS OF NON-PARENTAL CARE A WEEK AND BY ALL FAMILIES, 1975: PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Method of Care	Households Using External Care	All Households
Care in Own Home by:		
Relative	22.5	14.0
Nonrelative	20.9	13.0
Care in Other Home by:		
Relative	27.2	17.0
Nonrelative	16.6	10.3
Other Arrangements:		
Nursery school	5.8	3.6
Day care center	3.6	2.3
Other	3.4	2.2
Subtotal	100.0	62.4
No External Arrangements over 10 Hours a Week		37.6
Total	100.0	100.0

NOTE: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: Unco, Inc., National Childcare Consumer Study: 1975, prepared for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development (1975), vol. II, Table IV-2, p. 43.

TABLE 2. MAIN METHOD OF CARE OF CHILDREN UNDER 14 BY RACE AND ETHNICITY, 1975: PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Method of Care	Total	Non-Hispanic		Hispanic	Other
		White	Black		
Care in Own Home by:					
Relative	24.7	23.9	24.5	30.5	33.9
Nonrelative	<u>20.3</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>8.4</u>	<u>10.9</u>
Subtotal	45.0	47.5	30.5	38.9	44.8
Care in Other Home by:					
Relative	26.5	25.7	31.6	38.4	12.7
Nonrelative	<u>16.1</u>	<u>15.9</u>	<u>17.5</u>	<u>10.9</u>	<u>20.8</u>
Subtotal	42.6	41.6	49.1	49.3	33.5
Other Arrangements:					
Nursery/preschool	5.6	5.0	9.5	4.0	6.0
Day care center	3.5	2.6	6.7	4.9	10.7
Cooperative program	0.9	0.9	0.3	0.3	3.2
Before/after school program	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.1	1.1
Head Start	0.4	0.3	1.3	0.7	0.6
Other	<u>0.1</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>
Subtotal	<u>12.5</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>20.5</u>	<u>12.0</u>	<u>21.6</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: Unco, Inc., National Childcare Consumer Study: 1975, vol. I, Table IV-24.

TABLE 3. CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF WORKING MOTHERS WHOSE YOUNGEST CHILD IS LESS THAN 6 YEARS OLD BY RACE AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 14 YEARS OLD IN THE HOUSEHOLD, 1971; PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Method of Care	White		Black	
	One child	Two or more children under 14	One child	Two or more children under 14
Care in Own Home by:				
Parents or self	10	18	7	9
Older sibling	1	5	2	5
Other relative	10	8	21	15
Nonrelative	6	9	3	3
Combination <u>a/</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>16</u>
Subtotal	29	56	39	48
Care in Other Home by:				
Relative	19	13	35	21
Nonrelative	<u>34</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>9</u>
Subtotal	53	29	52	30
Other Arrangements:				
Day care center	13	5	7	19
Mother at work	3	3	2	2
Other	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Subtotal	<u>18</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>23</u>
Total	100	100	100	100

NOTE: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: Richard L. Shortlidge, Jr., and Patricia Brito, "How Women Arrange for the Care of Their Children While They Work: A Study of Child Care Arrangements, Costs, and Preferences in 1971," The Ohio State University, Center for Human Resource Research (January 1977), Tables 2-12.

a/ Includes combinations of family members and of relatives and nonrelatives.

TABLE 4. MAIN METHOD OF CHILD CARE FOR HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN LESS THAN SIX YEARS OLD BY MARITAL AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PARENTS, 1975: PERCENT DISTRIBUTION ^{a/}

Method of Care	Single-Parent Households		Two-Parent Households		
	Parent employed	Parent unemployed	Both employed	One employed	Both not employed
Care in Own Home by:					
Parent or self	6.6	43.7	13.2	28.6	56.5
Other relative	20.6	17.0	10.8	18.2	9.5
Nonrelative	8.7	8.6	17.5	19.5	4.9
Subtotal	35.9	69.3	41.5	66.3	70.9
Care in Other Home by:					
Relative	12.6	18.3	19.6	21.0	19.4
Nonrelative	19.7	4.0	22.1	6.0	1.0
Subtotal	32.3	22.3	41.7	27.0	20.4
Other Arrangements:					
Nursery school	13.0	3.4	9.1	4.5	4.5
Day care center	15.5	1.7	6.1	0.5	2.3
Head Start	0.5	3.0	0.1	0.3	0.4
Before/after school program	2.2	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.0
Cooperative program	0.7	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.4
Subtotal	31.9	8.3	16.7	6.9	8.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: Unco, Inc., National Childcare Consumer Study: 1975, vol. II, Table X-1.

^{a/} The household may also include children older than six.

TABLE 5. CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS FOR CHILDREN LESS THAN SIX YEARS OLD BY HOURS OF CARE PER WEEK, 1975: PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Method of Care	10 or More Hours a Week	30 or More Hours a Week
Care in Own Home by:		
Relative	23.0	14.4
Nonrelative	<u>22.8</u>	<u>9.0</u>
Subtotal	45.8	23.4
Care in Other Home by:		
Relative	26.4	21.3
Nonrelative	<u>13.0</u>	<u>25.5</u>
Subtotal	39.4	46.8
Other Arrangements:		
Nursery school	8.1	16.6
Day care center	3.9	13.3
Other	<u>2.8</u>	<u>a/</u>
Subtotal	<u>14.8</u>	<u>29.9</u>
Total	100.0	100.0

NOTE: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: CBO analysis of data from Unco, Inc., National Childcare Consumer Study: 1975.

a/ Less than 1 percent.

TABLE 6 . FAMILY INCOMES OF WOMEN NOT LOOKING FOR WORK BECAUSE THEY CANNOT ARRANGE CHILD CARE, 1975: PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

	U.S. Total (thousands)	Family Income					
		Under \$5,000	\$5,000-10,000	\$10,000-15,000	\$15,000-20,000	\$20,000-25,000	\$25,000-Over \$30,000
With Children under 6							
Wives	203	10.8	35.8	36.1	9.9	3.8	1.2
Female heads of families	97	86.4	13.2	0.5	--	--	--
With Children 6-14 Only							
Wives	146	5.3	29.6	39.5	11.4	7.6	1.8
Female heads of families	67	76.6	22.4	1.0	--	--	--

NOTE: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations from the Survey of Income and Education.

AGENDA

Wednesday, March 7, 1979

12:00

WELCOME

Archie E. Lapointe, Vice President
National Manpower Institute

Mary Hilton, Deputy Director
Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor

Joan Goodin, Executive Director
National Commission on Working Women

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Willard Wirtz, Chairman
National Manpower Institute

1:45 - 3:15

OVERVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE

Dana Friedman
Child Care Consultant

COMMUNITY NEEDS AND SOLUTIONS

Panel:

Moderator: Dana Friedman

Sophia Bracey Harris, Director
Federation of Community Controlled
Centers of Alabama (FOCAL)

Richard Tritter, President
Child Care Suppliers, Inc.
Massachusetts

John Eldred, Coordinator
Labor-Management Committee of the
Jamestown Area, New York

Michael Lyden, Executive Director
Education and Work Council of Erie
City and County, Pennsylvania

3:30 - 5:00

Concurrent Small Group Sessions

HOW DID YOU MANAGE TO DO THAT?

Resource People:

Judith Rosen, Director
Fairfax County Office for Children
Virginia

Miriam Kertzman, Director
Stride Rite Children's Center
Massachusetts

John Eldred, Coordinator
Labor-Management Committee of the
Jamestown Area, New York

Cristina Velarde, Coordinator
Spanish Education Development
Center Preschool, Washington, D.C.

Kathryn Senn Perry, Instructor
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Michael Lyden, Executive Director
Education and Work Council of Erie
City and County, Pennsylvania

June Rogers, Executive Director
Day Care and Child Development Council
of Tompkins County, New York

Mel Bourne, Administrator
Child Health Care Centers, Baltimore
Regional Joint Board, Amalgamated
Clothing and Textile Workers Union

Deborah Knox, Assistant Director
Worcester Area Career Education
Consortium, Massachusetts

7:30

DINNER SPEAKER

Barbara Bode, President
Children's Foundation

Thursday, March 8, 1979

8:30 - 10:15 FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

Panel:

Moderator: James A. Levine
Research Associate
Wellesley College Center for
Research on Women

Mike Suzuki, Deputy Commissioner
Administration for Public Services
HEW

Jan Calderón, Yocum, Executive Director
Day Care and Child Development
Council of America, Inc.

Truda Lash, Senior Scientist
Foundation for Child Development

Ellen Hoffman, Governmental Affairs
Children's Defense Fund

Miriam Kertzman, Director
Stride Rite Children's Center

Muriel Tuteur, Director
Amalgamated Day Care Center
Chicago

10:30 - 11:45 Concurrent Small Group Sessions

HOW DID YOU MAKE ENDS MEET?

Resource People:

Loise Sullivan, Director
Rosemont Center, Washington, D.C.

Alice Duncan, Special Consultant
for Day Care
Intermedics, Inc., Texas

Mike Garanzini, President
National Council of State Committees
for Children and Youth

Mickey Seltzer, Assistant Director
Brookline Human Relations/Youth
Resources Commission, Massachusetts

Muriel Tuteur, Director
Amalgamated Day Care Center, Chicago

Phoebe Carpenter, Administrator
4C for Central Florida

Barbara Geno, Director
Clayton Early Childhood Program
Missouri

Mary Agria, Executive Director
Mid-Michigan Community Action Council

12:30

FAMILY CIRCLE SURVEY

A presentation of the findings from the
Working Mother Child Care Survey

2:00 - 3:15

HOW TO DEVELOP AND USE DATA ABOUT COMMUNITY NEEDS

Panel:

Moderator: Dana Friedman
Child Care Consultant

Doreen Spilton, Developmental
Psychologist
U.S. Bureau of the Census

Bernice Lee, Agency Director
Childcare Switchboard, San Francisco

3:30 - 4:45

WHAT DO WE DO WHEN WE GO HOME?

Ideas for action and suggestions for maintaining contact with the kinds of people and programs represented at the conference will be presented by representatives from the small group discussions.

Appendix III

PARTICIPANT LIST

Community Solutions for Child Care

March 7-8, 1979

Washington, D.C.

Mary A. Agria
Executive Director
Mid-Michigan Community Action Council
P.O. Box 102
608 Wright Avenue
Alma, Michigan 48801
517/463-6404

Babette Ashby
Article Editor
Family Circle Magazine
488 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022
212/593-8000

Myrna Blyth
Executive Editor
Family Circle Magazine
488 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022
212/593-8000

Barbara Bode
President
Children's Foundation
1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/296-4450

Kathy Bonk
Media Specialist
National Commission on Working Women
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-6770

Mel Bourne
Administrator
Child Health Care Centers
c/o Hyman Blumberg Child
Day Care Center
600 W. North Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21217
301/728-1942

Phoebe Carpenter
Administrator
4C for Central Florida
816 Broadway
Orlando, Florida 32803
305/425-0509

Mark Clemmons
Researcher
Family Circle Magazine
488 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022
212/593-8000

Stephanie Clohesy
Executive Director
NOW, Legal Defense Fund
36 West 44th Street
New York, New York 10036
212/354-1225

Stephanie Lang Cole
Conference Coordinator
National Manpower Institute
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-4420

Sandra Dower
Day Care Director.
Young Women's Christian Association
401 North Main Street
Jamestown, New York 14701
716/485-1137

Alice Duncan, Special Consultant
for Day Care
Intermedics, Inc.
240 Tarpond Inn Village
Freeport, Texas 77540
713/233-8611

Audrey Edwards
Senior Editor
Family Circle Magazine
488 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022
212/593-8000

John Eldred
Coordinator
Labor-Management Committee of the
Jamestown Area
P.O. Box 819
Jamestown, New York 14071
716/661-2262

Dana Friedman
Child Care Consultant
881 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Michael J. Garanzini, S.J.
President
National Council of State Committees
for Children and Youth
39 Kirkland Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
617/876-9023

Barbara Geno
The Clayton Early Childhood Program
7423 Wellington Way
Clayton, Missouri 63105
314/726-2550

Mary Ann Gill
Child Care Center for the Superior Court
500 Indiana Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
202/783-2559

Jane Gold
ASPE/SSHD - Department of HEW
416 E. Hubert Humphrey Building
Washington, D.C. 20201
202/245-1794

Joan Goodin
Executive Director
National Commission on Working Women
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-6770

Christina Craf
Program Assistant
German Marshall Fund
11 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/797-6430

Alice Haber
Field Coordinator
Center for Systems & Program Development
1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/638-4039

Sophia B. Harris
Executive Director
Federation of Child Care Centers
of Alabama, Inc.
FOCAL
3703 Cleveland Avenue
Montgomery, Alabama 36101
205/262-3456

Alexis Herman
Director
Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210
202/523-6539

Mary Hilton
Deputy Director
Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210
202/523-6612

Ellen Hoffman, Director
Governmental Affairs
Children's Defense Fund
1520 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/483-1470

Miriam Kertzman
Director
Stride Rite Children's Center
960 Harrison Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02118
617/445-3400

Elizabeth D. Koontz
Chair
National Commission on Working Women
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-6770

Deborah Knox
Assistant Director
Worcester Area Career Education
Consortium
350 Mechanics Tower
Worcester, Massachusetts 01608
617/753-2924

Archie E. Lapointe
Executive Vice President
National Manpower Institute
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-2450

Truda Lash
Senior Scientist
Foundation for Child Development
345 E. 46th Street
New York, New York 10017
212/697-3150

Bernice S. Lee
Agency Director
Childcare Switchboard
3896 24th Street
San Francisco, California 94114
415/826-1130

Vivian Lee
National Manpower Institute
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-2450

James A. Levine, Research Associate
Wellesley College
Center for Research on Women
828 Washington Street
Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181
617/235-0320

Michael P. Lyden
Executive Director
Education & Work Council of Erie
City and County, Pennsylvania
1208 Baldwin Building
Erie, Pennsylvania 16501
814/455-3928

Joyce Lynn
Editor
Day Care and Child Development Reports
2626 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
202/333-5444

Pat Markey
Senate Committee on Human Resources
4230 Dirksen Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510
202/224-9287

Linda McCabe
Special Assistant to the Director
Community Services Administration
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506
202/254-6110

Laura Miller
Department of Health, Education & Welfare
Hubert Humphrey Building
Room 618E
Washington, D.C. 20201
202/245-3446

Ruth G. Nadel
Social Science Advisor
Women's Bureau - Department of Labor
200 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210
202/523-8916

Patricia Neighbors
Vice President
District Management Operations
Avon Products, Inc.
9 West 57th Street
New York, New York 10019
212/593-5874

Marie Oser
Texas Child Care '76, Inc.
8002 Bel Air Boulevard - Room 1122
Houston, Texas 77036
713/772-3752

Kathryn S. Perry
Instructor
University of Wisconsin-Extension
5346 N. Hollywood Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53217
414/964-6408

Sharon Parker
Assistant Director
National Commission Working Women
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-6770

Peggy Pizzo
Special Assistant to the Commissioner
Administration for Children, Youth
and Families
400 6th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20013
202/755-7776

Barbara Pomeroy
Executive Director
International Year of the Child
600 E Street, N.W. Room 505
Washington, D.C. 20471
202/456-6672

Sandra Porter
Project Specialist
National Commission on Working Women
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-6770

Sandi Risser
Information Specialist
National Commission on Working Women
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-6770

Alexa Robinson
President
Child's Play
958 West Side Drive
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760
301/997-2223

June R. Rogers
Executive Director
Day Care & Child Development
Council of Tompkins County
306 North Aurora Street
Ithaca, New York 14850
607/273-0259

Judith Rosen
Director
Fairfax County Office for Children
4100 Chain Bridge Road
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
703/691-3175

Michelle Seltzer
Assistant Director
Brookline Human Relations/
Youth Resources Commission
276 Washington Street
Brookline, Massachusetts 02158
617/731-0061

Sarah Sibley
Congressman Stanley Lundine's Office
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Doreen Spilton
Bureau of the Census
Statistical Research Division
Washington, D.C. 20233
301/655-4000

Karen Spar
Editor
Report on Preschool Education
2430 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Suite G-12
Washington, D.C. 20037
202/452-1600

Alma Stallworth
Chair
Black Child Development Council
1463 Rhode Island Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/387-1281

Loise Sullivan
Rosemont Center
2000 Rosemont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20010
202/265-9885

Michio Suzuki
Deputy Commissioner
Administration for Public Services
Office of Human Development
Department of Health, Education & Welfare
330 C Street, S.W. - Room 2217
Washington, D.C. 20024
202/245-0239

Jane Swanson
Senator George McGovern's Office
4239 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510
202/224-2321

Rosalind Thomas
Special Assistant to the Director
Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor
Room S3002
200 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210
202/523-6539

Richard P. Tritter
President
Child Care Suppliers, Inc.
60 Shawmut Road
Canton, Massachusetts 02021
617/828-5400

Muriel Tuteur
Director
Amalgamated Day Care Center
323 S. Ashland
Chicago, Illinois 60607
312/838-6138

Cristina Velarde
Coordinator
SED Center Preschool
1840 Kalorama Road, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
202/462-8850

Denie Weil
Program Officer
German Marshall Fund
11 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/797-6430

Jane Whitbread
Author
Family Circle Magazine
488 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022
212/593-8000

Dawnel C. White
Administrative Assistant
Center for Women's Opportunities
American Association of Community
& Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-7050

Denise Wilder
Congressional Fellow
Senate Committee on Human Resources
4320 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510
202/224-9287

Willard Wirtz
Chair
National Manpower Institute
1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-2450

Jan Calderón Yocum
Executive Director
Day Care and Child Development Council, Inc.
805 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/638-2816

Jill Zorack
Staff Assistant
Community Services Administration
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506
202/254-6110

HELPFUL PUBLICATIONS

Abt Associates, National Day Care Study, U.S. Department of HEW (Washington, D.C., 1978).

Auerbach, SteyeAnn and James Rivaldo, Rationale for Child Care Services, Programs vs. Politics, Vol. I, Human Sciences Press, Inc. (New York, 1975).

Childcare and Preschool: Options for Federal Support, Background paper of Congress and the Congressional Budget Office, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office (September, 1978).

Children's Political Checklist, Coalition for Children and Youth (Washington, D.C., 1978).

Clark-Stewart, Alison, Child Care in the Family: A Review of Research and Some Propositions for Policy, Academic Press (New York, 1977).

Galinsky, Ellen and William Hooks, The New Extended Family: Day Care That Works, Houghton Mifflin Co. (Boston, 1977).

Goldman, Karla Shepard and Michael Lewis, Child Care and Public Policy: A Case Study, Institute for Research in Human Development, Educational Testing Service (Princeton, New Jersey, 1976).

Grotberg, Edith, Day Care: Resources for Decisions, Office of Economic Opportunity, Government Printing Office (Washington, D.C., 1972).

Harman, David, Early Childhood: A Look at Policymaking, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies (New York, 1978).

Larson, Meredith, Federal Policy for Preschool Services: Assumptions and Evidence, Stanford Research Institute (1975).

Policy Issues in Day Care: Summaries of 21 Papers, U.S. Department of HEW, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation (Washington, D.C., 1977).

Scott, Myrtle and Sadie Grimmer (Eds.), Current Issues in Child Development, National Association for the Education of Young Children (Washington, D.C., 1977).

Senn, Milton, Speaking Out for America's Children, Yale University Press (New Haven, Connecticut, 1977).

Steiner, Gilbert, The Children's Cause, Brookings Institution (Washington, D.C., 1976).

Unco, Inc., National Child Care Consumer Survey, U.S. Department of HEW (Washington, D.C., 1976).

White, Sheldon, et al., Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations, Volumes I, II, III, IV. Huron Institute (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973).

Young, Dennis and Richard Nelson, Public Policy for Day Care of Young Children, Lexington Books (Lexington, Massachusetts, 1973).

Zigler, Edward and Susan Huntsinger, "Bringing Up Day Care," American Psychological Association Monitor, Vol. 8, (43) (March, 1977) pp. 9-39.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Association for Childhood Education

3615 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20016

Jim Jones, Director

Particularly helpful for teachers and staff.

Publishes a journal addressing current issues and curriculum concerns.

Black Child Development Institute

1463 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

Evelyn Moore, Director

Conducts research, follows legislation, and reports in a monthly newsletter.

Children's Defense Fund

1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036

Marian Wright Edelman, Director

Currently developing a national network for grassroots input into Washington and legislative activity. A toll free hotline is available for updates on current legislation:

800-424-9602. Numerous publications and

research studies are available related to children's policies.

Coalition for Children and Youth

815 15th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

Helene Gerstein, Director

An umbrella organization for national

organizations and local programs and individuals.

Publishes a monthly newsletter and offers publications on fundraising and community organizing.

Child Development Associate Consortium

805 15th Street, N.W. Suite 500

Washington, D.C. 20005

Ruth Massanga, Director

An organization devoted to training child care workers through a competency-based curriculum. Publications and research studies are available.

Children's Foundation
1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Barbara Bode, Director

Focusing on child care food programs and nutrition, publishes a newsletter and organizes family day care homes and child care centers to take advantage of food subsidies.

Child Welfare League of America
67 Irving Place
New York, New York 10003

Publishes a quarterly journal and monthly newsletter reporting on current legislation and issues. The Hecht Institute for Child Welfare Planning, located at 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, keeps abreast of Title XX developments in HEW and individual States.

Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
Mary McCaffrey

Follows legislation and program developments for handicapped children. Numerous publications and resources available.

Day Care and Child Development Council of America
805 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Jan Calderón Yocum, Director

Publishes numerous publications on child care planning, curriculum, and policy. Also publishes a monthly newsletter reporting on legislation and state and local programs.

National Association for the Education of Young Children
1834 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
Marilyn Smith, Director

Primary focus is on program and curriculum development. Also addresses legislative issues through a monthly journal and annual conference.

National Association for Retarded Children
1522 K Street, N.W., Suite 516
Washington, D.C. 20005
Paul Marchand, Director

National Council on Campus Child Care

709 N. Overlook Drive

Alexandria, VA 22305

Rae Burrell, Director

Publishes a newsletter and shares information regarding child care programs on college campuses.

National Council of Churches of Christ

475 Riverside Dr.

New York, New York 10027

Eileen Lindner, Director

Currently conducting advocacy training in 22 communities through local church groups.

National Parent-Teacher Association

700 N. Rush Street

Chicago, Illinois 60611

Georgia White Brandstadter, Director

National Organization for Women

Legal Defense and Education Fund

36 West 44th Street

New York, New York 10036

Stephanie Clohesy, Director

Will focus on children and families in their November, 1979 National Assembly on the Future of the Family. Also conducts research and follows legislation.

National Council of State Committees for Children and Youth

39 Kirkland Street

Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Mike Garanzini, President

Serves as an adviser to State governments.

RESEARCH AND DATA SOURCES

The Bush Centers

The Bush Training Program in Child Development
and Social Policy

Graduate School of Education

UCLA

Los Angeles, CA 90024

213/825-8338

Norma Feshbach and John Goodlad

Program in Child Development and Social Policy

3433 Mason Hall

University of Michigan

Ann Arbor, MI 48109

313/763-3717

Harold Stevenson

Bush Institute for Child and Family Policy

Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center

Highway 54 Bypass West

University of North Carolina

Chapel Hill, NC 27514

919/966-4121

James Gallagher

The Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy

P.O. Box 11A Yale Station

Yale University

New Haven, CT 06520

203/436-1592

Edward Zigler

The National Consortium on Children and Families

Bank Street College of Education

610 W. 112th Street

New York, NY 10025

212/663-7200

Richard Roupp

Pacific Oaks College
714 W. California Boulevard
Pasadena, CA 91105
213/795-9161
Elizabeth Prescott

Merrill Palmer Institute
71 East Ferry Avenue
Detroit, MI 48202
313/875-7450
Greta Fein

Center for the Study of Families and Children
Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies
Box 1516, Station B
Nashville, TN 37240
615/322-3535
Nicholas Hobbs
May Shayne - Public Liaison

The Center for the Study of Families and the State
Institute of Policy Sciences
Duke University
Box 4875, Duke Station
Durham, NC 27706
919/684-6612
Carol Snack

Columbia School of Social Work
622 W. 113th Street
New York, NY 10025
212/280-3048
Al Kahn
Sheila Kamerman

Abt Associates
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
617/492-7100
Jean Lazar

Center for Systems and Program Development
1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/833-1280
Ruth Perot

American Institute for Research
22 Hilliard Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
617/661-6180
Richard Rowe

Society for Research in Child Development
815 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/347-9380

National Academy of Sciences
National Committee on Child Development
Research and Public Policy
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20418
202/389-6934
Cheri Hayes

Library of Congress
Congressional Research Service
First and Independence Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20540
202/426-6228
Margaret Malone

Congressional Budget Office
Education and Employment Division
House Annex II
Washington, D.C. 20515
202/225-4745
Dave Mundel

ERIC Clearinghouse/Early Childhood Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Erickson Institute
1525 E. 53rd Street, Room 907
Chicago, Illinois 60615

No. 15
January 1979



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Bureau of the Census
Washington, D.C. 20233

TELEPHONE CONTACTS FOR DATA USERS BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Director
Deputy Director
Program and Policy Development Office (PPDO)
Congressional Liaison
Public Information Office (PIO)

Manuel D. Plotkin 301/763-5190
Robert L. Hagan -5192
Theodore G. Clemence, Chief -2758
Pennie Harvison -5360
Henry H. Smith, Chief -7273

DEMOGRAPHIC FIELDS

Associate Director for Demographic Fields
Demographic Analysis Staff (DAS)
Demographic Surveys Division (DSD)
Foreign Demographic Analysis Division (FDA)
Housing Division (HOUS)
International Statistical Programs Center (ISPC)
Population Division (POP)
Statistical Methods Division (SMD)
Assistant Director for Demographic Censuses
Decennial Census Division (DCD)

Daniel B. Levine -5167
James Wetzel, Chief -1774
Marvin Thompson, Chief -2777
John Aird, Chief 202/376-7692
Arthur F. Young, Chief 301/763-2863
J. Timothy Sprehe, Chief -2832
Meyer Zitter, Chief -7646
Charles D. Jones, Chief -2672
(vacant) -7670
Earle J. Gerson, Chief -1840

Demographic Subject Matter Contacts

Age and Sex: United States
States (age only)

Aliens

Annexation Population Counts

Apportionment

Armed Forces

Births and Birth Expectations; Fertility Statistics

Census Tract Population

Citizenship: Foreign Born Persons, Country of Birth;

Foreign Stock Persons

Mother Tongue; Current Language

Commuting (Journey to Work): Means of Transportation;
Place of Work

Consumer Expenditure Survey

Consumer Purchases and Ownership of Durables

Crime Surveys: Victimization, General Information

Data Analysis and Publication

Current Population Survey

Decennial Census: General Plans

Content and Tabulations

Minority Statistics Program

National Services Program--Services for

Minority Organizations

1980 Census Update (Quarterly Newsletter)

Disabled

Education; School Enrollment

Employment; Unemployment; Labor Force

Farm Population

Health Surveys

Households and Families: Size; Number; Marital Status;
Quarterly Household Survey

Housing: Housing Information, Decennial Census

Annual Housing Survey

Components of Inventory Change Survey

Contract Block Program

Housing Vacancy Data

Residential Finance

Income Statistics: Decennial Census

Current Surveys; Revenue Sharing

POP Jennifer Peck -5184
" Edward Hanlon -5072
" Elmore Serralle -7571
" Joe Miller -7955
" Robert Speaker -7953
" Jennifer Peck -5184
" Maurice Moore -5303
" Robert Speaker -7955
" Elmore Serralle -7571
" Edith McArthur -5050
" Philip Fulton -5226
DSD Gail Hoff -2380
POP Jack McNeil -5032
DSD Linda Murphy -1735
DAS Adolfo Paz -1765
DSD Gregory Russell -2773
DCD Morris Gorinson -2748
" Marshall Turner -7325
" Clifton Jordan -5169
" Vivien Lipscombe -5169
" Carolee Bush -2740
POP Jack McNeil -5032
" Larry Suter -5050
" Thomas Palumbo -2825
" Diana DeAre -7955
DSD Robert Mangold -5508
POP Arthur Norton -7950
DSD Edward Knowles -2802
HOUS Bill Downs -2873
" Edward Montfort -2881
" Elmo Beach -1096
" Richard Knapp -2873
" Margaret Harper -5840
" Betty Kent -2866
POP George Patterson -5682
" Dan Burkhead -5060

Demographic Subject Matter Contacts--con.

Incorporated/Unincorporated Places	POP Robert Speaker	301/763-7959
Industry and Occupation Statistics (See also Economic Fields)	" John Priebe	-5144
Institutional Population	" Arthur Norton	-7950
International Population	" Samuel Baum	-2870
Land Area	" Joel Miller	-7955
Longitudinal Surveys	DSD George Gray	-2764
Migration; Mobility	POP Kris Hansen	-5255
Mortality and/or Death	" Martin O'Connell	-5303
Outlying Areas (Puerto Rico, etc.)	" Jennifer Peck	-5184
Population Count Complaints	" Joel Miller	-7955
Population: General Information; Census Data; Characteristics; Survey Data	" Johanna Barten	-5002 or -5020
Population Estimates: Local Areas; Revenue Sharing	" Mary Kay Healy	-7722
Congressional Districts; SMSA's	Donald Starsinic	-5072
Individual States	Edward Hanlon	-5072
United States (National)	" Jennifer Peck	-5184
Estimates Research	" Richard Irwin	-7883
Counties; Federal-State Cooperative Program for Local Population Estimates	" Fred Cavanaugh	-7722
Population Projections	" Signe Wetrogan	-5300
Household Projections	" Robert Grymes	-7950
Poverty Statistics; Low Income Areas	" Arno Wignard	-5790
Prisoner Surveys: National Prisoner Statistics	DSD Thomas Petersik	-1832
Data Analysis and Publication	DAS John Wallerstedt	-1778
Race and Ethnic Statistics:	POP Nampeo McKenney	-7890
Race	" Patricia Berman	-7592
American Indian Population	" Karen Crook/Edna Paisano	-7572
Asian Americans	" Patricia Johnson	-7572
Black Population	" Dwight Johnson	-7572
Ethnic Populations	" Elmore Serralle	-7571
Spanish Population	" Edward Fernandez	-5219
Religion	" Elmore Serralle	-7571
Revenue Sharing (See also Economic Fields--Governments; Income Statistics)	" Joseph Knott	-5158
Sampling Methods	SMD Charles Jones	-2672
Social Indicators	DAS Lois Raley	-2337
Social Stratification	POP Larry Suter	-5050
Special Censuses	DCD George Hurn	-5806
Special Surveys	DSD Evan Davey	-2767
SMSA's: Area Definition and Total Population	POP Richard Forstall	-5591
Travel Surveys	DSD John Cannon	-1798
Urban/Rural Residence	POP Diana DeArc	-7955
Veteran Status	" Mark Littman	-7962
Voting and Registration	" Jerry Jennings	-7946
Voting Rights	" Gilbert Felton	-5313

ECONOMIC FIELDS

Associate Director for Economic Fields	Shirley Kallek	-5274
Business Division (BUS)	Tyler R. Sturdevant, Chief	-7564
Construction Statistics Division (CSD)	Leonora M. Gross, Chief	-7163
Foreign Trade Division (FTD)	Emanuel A. Lipscomb, Chief	-5342
Governments Division (GOVS)	Sherman Landau, Chief	-7366
Industry Division (IND)	Milton Eisen, Chief	-5850
Assistant Director for Economic and Agriculture	Richard B. Quanrud	-7356
Censuses, and Chief, Economic Census Staff (ECS)	Orvin L. Wilhite, Chief	-5230
Agriculture Division (AGR)	Roger H. Bugenhagen, Chief	-7735
Economic Surveys Division (ESD)		

Economic Subject Matter Contacts

Agriculture: General Information	AGR Arnold Bollenbacher	-5170
Crop Statistics	" Donald Jahnke	-1939
Farm Economics	" John Blackledge	-5819
Livestock Statistics	" Thomas Monroe	-1974
Special Surveys	" Kenneth Norrell	-5914
Construction Statistics:		
Census/Industries Surveys	CSD Alan Blum	-5435
Special Trades; Contractors; General Contractor-Builder	" Andrew Visnansky	-7547
Current Programs	" David Siskind	-7165

Economic Subject Matter Contacts--con.

Construction Statistics Current Programs--con.:

Construction Authorized by Building Permits (C40 Series);	CSD	John Pettis	301/763-7244
and Residential Demolitions (C45 Series)			
Expenditures on Residential Additions, Alterations,	"	Elinor Champion	-5717
Maintenance and Repairs, and Replacements (C50 Series)			
Housing Starts (C20 Series); Housing Completions (C22	"	William Mittendorf	-5731
Series); and New Residential Construction in Selected	"	Steve Berman	-7842
SNRA's (C21 Series)	"	Juliana Van Borkum	-7314
Price Indexes for New One-Family Homes Sold (C27 Series)	"	Allan Meyer	-5717
Sales of New One-Family Homes (C25 Series)			
Value of New Construction Put in Place (C30 Series)			
County Business Patterns	ESD	James Anastad	-8642
Employment/Unemployment Statistics	POP	Thomas Palumbo	-2825
Energy Related Statistics	DIKS	Elmer S. Bilos	-7184
Enterprise Statistics	ESD	John Dadds	-7086
Environmental Surveys	IND	Wayne McCaughy	-5616
Exports, Origin of	"	Arthur Horowitz	-7666
Foreign Trade Information	FTD	Juanita Noone	-5140
Governments: Criminal Justice Statistics	GOVS	Diana Cull	-2842
Eastern States Government Sector	"	Howard Sales	-7783
Western States Government Sector	"	Ulvey Harris	-5344
Employment	"	Alan Stevens	-5086
Finance	"	Vancil Kane	-5847
Governmental Organization	"	Muriel Miller	-5308
Revenue Sharing (See also Demographic Fields)	"	John Coleman	-5272
Taxation	"	Earle Knapp	-5302
Income Statistics: Decennial Census	POP	George Patterson	-5682
Current Surveys; Revenue Sharing	"	Dan Burkhead	-5060
Industry and Commodities Classification	ESD	Walter Necce	-5449
Manufactures: Census/Annual Survey of Manufactures	IND	Arthur Horowitz	-7666
Subject Reports (Concentration, Production			
Index, Water, etc.)	"	Arthur Horowitz	-7666
Durables	"	Dale Gordon	-7304
Nondurables	"	Michael Zampogna	-2510
Current Programs	"	John Wikoff	-7800
Shipments, Inventories, and Orders	"	Ruth Runyan	-2502
Durables	"	Paul Berard	-2518
Nondurables	"	Robert Nealon	-5914
Fuels/Electric Energy Consumed by Manufactures	"	John McNamee	-5938
Mineral Industries	"	John McNamee	-5938
Minority Businesses	ESD	Jerry McDonald	-5182
Puerto Rico: Censuses of Retail Trade, Wholesale Trade, and			
Selected Service Industries	BUS	Alvin Barten	-5282
Retail Trade: Census	"	Bobby Russell	-7038
Monthly Retail Trade Report: Accounts Receivable;			
and Monthly Department Store Sales	"	Conrad Alexander	-7128
Annual Retail Trade Report; Advance Monthly			
Retail Sales; Monthly Retail Inventories Survey	"	Irving True	-7660
Selected Service Industries: Census	"	Dorothy Reynolds	-7039
Current Services Reports	"	Edward Gutfred	-7077
Transportation: Commodity Transportation Survey; Truck Inventory			
and Use; Domestic Movement of Foreign Trade Data	ESD	Robert Torene	-5430
Travel Surveys	DSD	John Cannon	-1793
Wholesale Trade: Census	BUS	Faran Stoetzel	-5281
Current Wholesale Sales and Inventories;			
Green Coffee Survey; Canned Food Survey	"	Ronald Pienckyoski	-5294

USER SERVICES, PUBLICATIONS, AND FIELD OPERATIONS

Associate Director for Administration and Field Operations	(vacant)	-5238
Administrative Services Division (ASD)	Henry J. Huzmann, Chief	-5400
Data User Services Division (DUSD)	Michael G. Garland, Chief	-7720
Assistant Director for Field Operations	Curtis T. Hill	-7247
Field Division (FLD)	Forrest P. Cawley, Chief	-5000

User Services

Age Search	DUSD	Christine Stewart	-7337
Bureau of the Census Catalog	"	Ann King	-5574
Census Procedures, History of	"	Frederick Bohme	-7337
College Curriculum Support Project	"	Les Solomon	-5512
Computer Tapes; Computer Programs	"	Larry Carbaugh	-2400
Data User News, Monthly Newsletter	"	Nancy Smith	-2400

User Services--cont

Data User Training: Seminars, Workshops, Training Courses,
Conferences,
Exhibits

Guides and Indexes

Map Orders

Microfilm

Public Use Samples (Microdata)

Special Tabulations

State Data Center Program

Statistical Compendia:

Congressional District Data Reports (for Congressional

District Atlas, see Geographic Matters, below);

Historical Statistics of the United States

County and City Data Book

Statistical Abstract; Pocket Data Book

Summary Tape Processing Centers

Unpublished Census Tables

DUSD	Deborah Barrett	301/763-5483
"	Douglas Moyer	-5512
"	Gary Young	-2400
"	Deloris Fontress	-2400
"	Paul Manka	-2400
"	Paul Zeisset	-7868
"	Larry Carbaugh	-2400
"	Warren Glimpsa	-1932

"	Helen Tair	-5475
"	Mark Herrenbruck	-5358
"	William Lerner	-7024
"	Gary Young	-2400
"	Paul Manka	-2400

Publications

Library

Publications Microfiche

Reference Service

Subscriber Services (Publications)

ASD	Betty Baxtresser	-5040
"	Dorothy Dunham	-5511
"	Richard Cooper	-5042
"	Daisy Williams	-7472

Field Operations

Census Bureau
Regional Offices

Regional Director

Telephone
Number

Atlanta, GA	Thomas W. McWhirter	404/881-2271
Boston, MA	Arthur G. Dukakis	617/223-2327
Charlotte, NC	Joseph R. Norwood	704/371-6142
Chicago, IL	Stanley D. Moore	312/353-6251
Dallas, TX	Percy R. Millard	214/749-2814
Denver, CO	Richard C. Burt	303/234-3924
Detroit, MI	Robert G. McWilliam	313/226-7742
Kansas City, KS	Rex L. Pullin	816/374-4601
Los Angeles, CA	C. Michael Long	213/824-7317
New York, NY	John G. Cullinane	212/264-3860
Philadelphia, PA	Porter S. Rickley	215/597-4920
Seattle, WA	John E. Tharaldson	206/442-7800

Data User
Services Officer

Telephone
Number

Wayne Wall	404/881-2274
Judith Cohen	617/223-0668
Lawrence McNutt	704/371-6144
Stephen Laue	312/353-0980
Valerie McFarland	214/749-2394
Jerry O'Donnell	303/234-5825
Timothy Jones	313/226-4675
Kenneth Wright	816/374-4601
E. J. (Bud) Steinfeld	213/824-7291
Joffrey Hall	212/264-4730
David Lewis	215/597-8314
Larry Hartke	206/442-7030

STATISTICAL AND SURVEY METHODOLOGY, CENSUS USE RESEARCH, AND GEOGRAPHIC MATTERS

Associate Director for Statistical Standards and Methodology
Geography Division (GEO)

Research Center for Measurement Methods (RCMM)

Statistical Research Division (SRD)

Chief Census Research and Technical Advisor

Harold Nisselson	301/763-2562
Jacob Silver, Chief	-5636
Barbara A. Bailar, Chief	-7028
James L. O'Brien, Acting Chief	-5350
Eli S. Marks	-7650

Census Use Research

Publications

Economic Programs

Social Programs

Systems Technology

Survey Methodology Information System

Geographic Matters

Area Measurement and Centers of Population

Boundaries and Annexations

1970/1980 Census Geography

Computer Graphics and Computer Mapping

Congressional District Atlas

GBF/DIME System

Geographic Statistical Areas

Geographic Uses of Earth Resources Satellite Technology:

United States

International

GE-50 Series Maps

Revenue Sharing Geography

Urban Atlas

SRD	Donald S. Luria	-7490
"	Bonnie Lyons	-2393
"	Dani Emery	-7533
"	Hal Wallach	-2588
"	Greg Nowakowski	-2422
"	Patricia Fuenlhart	-7600

GEO	Lawrence Taylor	-7261
"	Frances Barnett	-5437
"	Donald Hirschfeld	-2668
"	Frederick Broome	-7442
"	Robert Hamill	-5437
"	Robert La Macchia	-7315
"	Alice Winterfeld	-7291

"	James Dvais	-5808
"	Robert Durland	-5720
"	Dan Jones	-7818
"	Frances Barnett	-5437
"	Dan Jones	-7818

Listing of Telephone Contacts for Data Users compiled by Mathilda R. Bowman, User Training Branch,
Data User Services Division, Bureau of the Census. Write for additional copies, or call 301/763-5512.

SUBJECT MATTER NOT LISTED: For information, call 301/763-2400

FUNDING SOURCES AND RESOURCES

The Foundation Center
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Annual reports, directories and computer
services providing information about
philanthropic foundations.

The Grantsmanship Center
1015 Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90015

and

1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Publishes a newsletter eight times a
year reporting on Federal and Foundation
grant patterns.

Books:

How To Raise Money for Kids (Public and Private),
available from the Coalition for Children and Youth,
815 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005
(\$2.00)

How To Raise Funds from Foundations, Joseph Dermer,
Public Service Materials, 355 Lexington Avenue,
New York, New York 10017, 1975. (\$8.95)

Stalking the Large Green Grant, Ingrid Utech,
National Youth Work Alliance, 1346 Connecti-
cut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, Super-
intendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing
Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (\$18.00)

Other Helpful Newsletters
Related to Child Care Programs and Policies:

Child Care Information Exchange, Roger Neugebauer,
Editor, 70 Oakley Road, Belmont, MA. 02178

Day Care and Child Development REPORTS, Joyce Lynn,
Editor, 2814 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington,
D.C. 20007

Report on Preschool Education, Karen Spar, Editor,
2430 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite G-12
Washington, D.C. 20037

FOCUS: Coalition for Children and Youth,
815 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - REGIONAL OFFICES

CALIFORNIA

(Western: Alaska, American Samoa, Arizona (except Navaho Nation), California, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands)

550 Kearny Street
Room #400
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 556-4951

GEORGIA

(Southeast: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee)

1100 Spring Street, N. W.
Room #200
Atlanta, GA 30309
(404) 526-5131

ILLINOIS

(Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Wisconsin)

536 South Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60605
(312) 353-6664

NEW YORK

(Northeast: Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Virginia, West Virginia)

729 Alexander Road
Princeton, NJ 08540
(609) 452-1712

TEXAS

(West Central: Arizona (Navaho Nation only), Arkansas, Colorado, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Wyoming)

1100 Commerce Street
Room #5-D-22
Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 749-2877

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE: OFFICE OF EDUCATION - REGIONAL
OFFICES

REGION 1

(Connecticut, Maine,
Massachusetts, New Hampshire,
Rhode Island, Vermont)

John F. Kennedy Federal Building
Government Center
Boston, MA 02203
(617) 223-6831

REGION 2

(New York, New Jersey, Puerto
Rico, the Virgin Islands)

26 Federal Plaza
New York, NY 10007
(212) 264-4600

REGION 3

(Delaware, District of Columbia,
Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia,
West Virginia)

Post Office Box #13716
3535 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19101
(215) 597-6492

REGION 4

(Alabama, Florida, Georgia,
Kentucky, Mississippi, North
Carolina, South Carolina,
Tennessee)

50 Seventh Street, N. E.
Atlanta, GA 30323
(404) 526-5817

REGION 5

(Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota,
Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin)

300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 353-5160

REGION 6

(Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico,
Oklahoma, Texas)

1114 Commerce Street
Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 749-3396

REGION 7

(Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska)

601 East 12th Street
Kansas City, MO 64106
(816) 374-3436

REGION 8

(Colorado, Montana, North Dakota,
South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming)

Federal Office Building
1961 Stout Street
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 837-3373

REGION 9

(Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada,
Guam, American Samoa, Wake Island,
Trust Territories of the Pacific
Islands)

Federal Office Building
50 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 556-6746

REGION 10

(Alaska, Idaho, Oregon,
Washington)

Arcade Plaza
1321 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 442-0420

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE: OFFICE OF SOCIAL AND
REHABILITATION SERVICES (TITLE XI) - REGIONAL OFFICES

REGION 1

CONNECTICUT

Commissioner
State Welfare Department
110 Bartholomew Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

MAINE

Commissioner
State Department of Health and Welfare
State House
Augusta, ME 04330

MASSACHUSETTS

Commissioner
Massachusetts Department of
Public Welfare
600 Washington Street
Boston, MA 02111

Commissioner
Massachusetts Commission for the Blind
39 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Commissioner
Department of Health and Welfare
State House Annex
Concord, NH 03301

RHODE ISLAND

Director, Department of Social
and Rehabilitative Services
Aime J. Forand
State Office Building
600 New London Avenue
Cranston, RI 02920

VERMONT

Secretary
Agency of Human Services
State Office Building
Montpelier, VT 05602

REGION 2

NEW JERSEY

Commissioner
Department of Institutions and Agencies
135 West Hanover Street
Trenton, NJ 08625

NEW YORK

Acting Commissioner
Department of Social Services
1450 Western Avenue
Albany, NY 12243

REGION 3

DELAWARE

Secretary
Department of Health and Social Services
Delaware State Hospital
New Castle, DE 19720

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Director
Department of Human Resources
District Building
14th and E Streets, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

MARYLAND

Secretary
Department of Human Resources
1100 North Eutaw Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

PENNSYLVANIA

Secretary
Department of Human Welfare
Health and Welfare Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120

VIRGINIA

Commissioner
Department of Welfare
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond, VA 23288

Director
Virginia Commission for the
Visually Handicapped
3003 Parkwood Avenue
Richmond, VA 23221

WEST VIRGINIA

Commissioner
Department of Welfare
1900 Washington Street, East
Charleston, WV 25305

REGION 4

ALABAMA

Commissioner
State Department of Pensions and Security
64 North Union Street
Montgomery, AL 36104

FLORIDA

Secretary
Department of Health and
Rehabilitative Services
1323 Winswood Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32301

GEORGIA

Acting Commissioner
Department of Human Resources
State Office Building
Atlanta, GA 30334

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE: OFFICE OF SOCIAL AND
REHABILITATION SERVICES (TITLE XX) - REGIONAL OFFICES (Continued)

KENTUCKY

Secretary

Department for Human Resources
Capitol Building Annex, Room #201
Frankfort, KY 40601

MISSISSIPPI

Commissioner

State Department of Public Welfare
Post Office Box #4321
Fondren Station
Jackson, MS 39216

NORTH CAROLINA

Secretary

Department of Human Resources
325 North Salisbury Street
Raleigh, NC 27611

SOUTH CAROLINA

Commissioner

Department of Social Services
Post Office Box #1520
Columbia, SC 29202

TENNESSEE

Commissioner

State Department of Human Services
204 State Office Building
Nashville, TN 37219

REGION 5

ILLINOIS

Acting Director

Illinois Department of Public Aid
222 College Street
Springfield, IL 62706

INDIANA

Administrator

Indiana Department of Public Welfare
State Office Building, Room #701
100 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46204

MICHIGAN

Director

Department of Social Services
Commerce Center Building
300 South Capitol Avenue
Lansing, MI 48936

MINNESOTA

Commissioner

Department of Public Welfare
Centennial Building
658 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55155

OHIO

Director

Ohio Department of Public Welfare
State Office Tower, 32nd Floor
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

WISCONSIN

Secretary

Department of Health and Social Services
1 West Wilson Street
Madison, WI 53702

REGION 6

ARKANSAS

Director, Department of Social and
Rehabilitation Services

406 National Old Line Insurance Building
Little Rock, AR 72201

LOUISIANA

Commissioner

Health and Human Resources Administration
Post Office Box #44215
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

NEW MEXICO

Executive Director

Health and Social Services Department
Post Office Box #2348
PERA Building
Santa Fe, NM 87508

OKLAHOMA

Director

Department of Institutions/Social
and Rehabilitative Services
Post Office Box #25352
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

TEXAS

Commissioner

State Department of Public Welfare
John H. Reagan Building
Austin, TX 78701

GUAM

Acting Director

Guam Department of Public Health
and Social Services
Government of Guam

HAWAII

Director

State Department of Social Services and Housing
Post Office Box #339
Honolulu, HI 96809

NEVADA

Director, State Department of Human Resources
Union Federal Building
308 North Curry Street
Carson City, NV 89701

REGION 10

ALASKA

Commissioner

Department of Health and Social Services
Pouch H
Juneau, AK 99801

197107

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE: OFFICE OF SOCIAL AND
REHABILITATION SERVICES (TITLE XX) - REGIONAL OFFICES (Continued)

IDAHO

Administrator
Department of Health and Welfare
State House
Boise, ID 83720

OREGON

Director
Department of Human Resources
318 Public Service Building
Salem, OR 97310

WASHINGTON

Secretary
Department of Social and
Health Services
Post Office Box #1788
Olympia, WA 98504

REGION 7

IOWA

Commissioner
Department of Social Services
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319

KANSAS

Secretary
Department of Social and
Rehabilitation Services
State Office Building
Topeka, KS 66612

MISSOURI

Director
Department of Social Services
Broadway State Office Building
Jefferson City, MO 65101

NEBRASKA

Director
Department of Public Welfare
1526 "K" Street, Fourth Floor
Lincoln, NE 68508

REGION 8

COLORADO

Executive Director
Department of Social Services
1575 Sherman Street
Denver, CO 80203

MONTANA

Director, Department of Social
and Rehabilitation Services
Post Office Box #1723
Helena, MT 59601

NORTH DAKOTA

Executive Director
Social Service Board of
North Dakota
State Capitol Building
Bismarck, ND 58501

SOUTH DAKOTA

Secretary
Department of Social Services
State Capitol Building
Pierre, SD 57501

UTAH

Executive Director
Department of Social Services
221 State Capitol
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

WYOMING

Acting Coordinator
Department of Health and Social Services
State Office Building, West
Room #317
Cheyenne, WY 82001

REGION 9

ARIZONA

Director
State Department of Economic Security
1515 West Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85005

CALIFORNIA

Secretary
State of California Health and
Welfare Agency
915 Capitol Mall, Room #200
Sacramento, CA 95814

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT - REGIONAL AND AREA OFFICES

REGION 1

(Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)

John F. Kennedy Federal
Office Building
Boston, MA 02203

Area Offices

Manchester, NH, Boston, MA,
Hartford, CT

REGION 2

(New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands)

26 Federal Plaza
New York, NY 10007

Area Offices

New York, NY, Newark, NJ,
Camden, NJ, Buffalo, NY,
San Juan, PR

REGION 3

(Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia)

Curtis Building
6th and Walnut Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Area Offices

Pittsburgh, PA, Philadelphia, PA,
District of Columbia, Baltimore,
MD, Richmond, VA

REGION 4

(Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee)

1371 Peachtree Street, N. E.
Pershing Point Plaza
Atlanta, GA 30309

Area Offices

Birmingham, AL, Jacksonville, FL,
Atlanta, GA, Louisville, KY,
Jackson, MS, Greensboro, NC,
Columbia, SC, Knoxville, TN

REGION 5

(Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin)

300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

Area Offices

Detroit, MI, Chicago, IL, Indianapolis, IN, Minneapolis, MN,
Columbus, OH, Milwaukee, WI

REGION 6

(Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas)

Federal Office Building
1100 Commerce Street
Dallas, TX 75242

Area Offices

Dallas, TX, Oklahoma City, OK,
San Antonio, TX, New Orleans, LA,
Little Rock, AR

REGION 7

(Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska)

Federal Office Building
911 Walnut Street
Kansas City, MO 64106

Area Offices

Kansas City, KS, St. Louis, MO,
Omaha, NE

REGION 8

(Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming)

Federal Building
1405 Curtis Street
Denver, CO 80202

Area Offices

No Area Offices. Insuring
Offices: Casper, WY, Helena, MT,
Fargo, ND, Sioux Falls, SD, Salt
Lake City, UT

REGION 9

(Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Guam, American Samoa)

450 Golden Gate Avenue
Post Office #36003
San Francisco, CA 94102

Area Offices

San Francisco, CA, Los Angeles, CA

REGION 10

(Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington)

Arcade Plaza Building
1321 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

Area Offices

Seattle, WA
Portland, OR

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE: LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE
ADMINISTRATION - REGIONAL OFFICES

REGION I: BOSTON

(Connecticut, Maine,
Massachusetts, New Hampshire,
Rhode Island, Vermont)

Regional Administrator
LEAA, U. S. Department of Justice
100 Summer Street, 19th Floor
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 223-2671 (Administration)

REGION II: NEW YORK

(New Jersey, New York, Puerto
Rico, Virgin Islands)

Regional Administrator
LEAA, U. S. Department of Justice
26 Federal Plaza, Room #1337
New York, NY 10007
(212) 264-0511 (Administration)

REGION III: PHILADELPHIA

(Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania,
Virginia, District of Columbia,
West Virginia)

Regional Administrator
LEAA, U. S. Department of Justice
325 Chestnut Street, Suite 7800
Philadelphia, PA 19106
(212) 597-0807 (Admin. & LEAP)

REGION IV: ATLANTA

(Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky,
Mississippi, North Carolina, South
Carolina, Tennessee)

Regional Administrator
LEAA, U. S. Department of Justice
730 Peachtree Street, N. E., Room #985
Atlanta, GA 30308
(404) 526-5858 (Administration)

REGION V: CHICAGO

(Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan,
Minnesota, Wisconsin)

Regional Administrator
LEAA, U. S. Department of Justice
O'Hare Office Center, Room 7121
3166 Des Plaines Avenue
Des Plaines, IL 60018
(312) 353-1203

REGION VI: DALLAS

(Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico,
Oklahoma, Texas)

Acting Regional Administrator
LEAA, U. S. Department of Justice
200 Praetorian Building
1607 Main Street
Dallas, TX 75201
(214) 749-7211

REGION VII: KANSAS CITY

(Iowa, Kansas, Missouri,
Nebraska)

Regional Administrator
LEA, U. S. Department of Justice
436 State Avenue
Kansas City, KS 66101
(816) 374-4501 (Administration)

REGION VIII: DENVER

(Colorado, Montana, North Dakota,
South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming)

Regional Administrator
LEAA, U. S. Department of Justice
6324 Federal Building
19th and Stout Streets
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 837-2456 (Administration)

REGION IX: SAN FRANCISCO

(Arizona, American Samoa, California,
Guam, Hawaii, Nevada)

Regional Administrator
LEAA, U. S. Department of Justice
1860 El Camino Real, 3rd Floor
Burlingame, CA 94010
(415) 976-7256 (Administration)

REGION X: SEATTLE

(Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington)

Regional Administrator
LEAA, U. S. Department of Justice
130 Andover Park, East
Seattle, WA 98188
(206) 442-1170

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, WOMEN'S BUREAU REGIONAL OFFICES

Region I

Room 1700-C JFK Building
Boston, Massachusetts 02203
Phone: (617) 223-4036

(Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts,
New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)

Region II

1515 Broadway - Room 3575,
New York, New York 10036
Phone: (212) 399-2935

(New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico,
Virgin Islands)

Region III

Room 15230
Gateway Building
3535 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Phone: (215) 596-1183

(Delaware, District of Columbia,
Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia,
West Virginia)

Region IV

1371 Peachtree Street, N.E., Rm. 737
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Phone: (404) 881-4461

(Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky,
Mississippi, North Carolina, South
Carolina, Tennessee)

Region V

230 South Dearborn St., 8th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60604
Phone: (312) 353-6985

(Illinois, Indiana, Michigan,
Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin)

Region VI

Room 505
555 Griffin Square Building
Griffin and Young Streets
Dallas, Texas 75202
Phone: (214) 767-6985

(Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico,
Oklahoma, Texas)

Region VII

2511 Federal Building
911 Walnut Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
Phone: (816) 374-6108

(Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska)

Region VIII

1432 Federal Building
1961 Stout Street
Denver, Colorado 80202
Phone: (303) 837-4138

(Colorado, Montana, North Dakota,
South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming)

Region IX

Room 11411, Federal Building
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102
Phone: (415) 556-2377
(Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada)

Region X

Room 3032, Federal Office Building
909 First Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98174
Phone: (206) 442-1534

(Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington)

DAY CARE PROGRAMS IN FEDERAL AGENCIES

International Child Development Center
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Frances Montez, Director
202/632-5127

HUD Child Center
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Michelle Sumka, Director
202/554-2331

Boston Government Center Child Care Corp.
Suzanne Halloran
617/742-5171

Penthouse Day Care
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Barbara Thorn, Director
202/488-3362

Federal Employees Cooperative Learning Center
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Education
National Institute of Education
Evan Nelson, Director
202/245-8414

Child Care Center
Department of Agriculture (Beltsville)
Karen Johnson, Director
301/344-3045

Day Center
National Institutes of Health
Sherry Kojak, Director
301/496-5144

NASA (Goddard)
National Aeronautics & Space Administration
Barbara Karth, Director
301/344-8588

U.S. Department of Labor
Susan Brenner, Director
202/523-8553

Social Security Administration
Baltimore Center, Baltimore, Maryland
Loretta Allen-Adams, Director
301/578-0423

CHILD CARE PROGRAMS IN INDUSTRIES
AND LABOR UNIONS

Industry

Emporer Clock Company Day Care
P.O. Box A-T
Fairhope, Alaska 38532

Living and Learning Centers
1312 Hall Boulevard
Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002
(Connecticut General Life Insurance Company)

Stride Rite Children's Center
960 Harrison Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02118

Intermedics, Inc.
240 Tarpond Inn Village
Freeport, Texas 77540

Mississippi Industries for the Blind Day Care Center
2501 N. West Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39202

Westfield Day Care and Rural Child Development Center
5 South Portage Street
Westfield, New York 14787
(Chatauqua Opportunities, Inc., Welch Foods)

Photo Corporation of America Child Development Center
801 Crestdale Avenue
Matthews, North Carolina 28105

Southern Shops Nursery 1
7124 Maple Street,
Spartanburg, South Carolina 29303

Mary G. Hutcheson Child Development Center
of Forney Engineering Company
3405 Wiley Post Road
Addison, Texas 75001

Polaroid Corporation
750 Main Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Children's Playroom
Playboy Resort,
Highway 50
Lake Geneva, Wisconsin 53147

Union

Child Health Care Center
c/o Hyman Blumberg Child Day Care Center
600 W. North Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21217
(Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers)

Amalgamated Day Care Center
323 S. Ashland
Chicago, Illinois 60707